VOLUME XLII NO. 4

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL CARDOZO
The Catholic University of America

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame

GEORGE L. A. REILLY
Seton Hall University

EDWARD GARGAN
Loyola University, Chicago

CHARLES H. METZGER, S.J.
West Baden College

WALTER W. WILKINSON
Georgetown University

Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1957

ARTICLES

The Moral Laws of History . . . . . *Oscar Halecki* 409

The German Center Party During World War I. An Internal Study . . . . . *John K. Zeender* 441

BOOK REVIEWS 469

NOTES AND COMMENTS 522

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 533

BOOKS RECEIVED 539

GENERAL INDEX i

VOLUME XLII NO. 4

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL CARDOZO
The Catholic University of America

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame

GEORGE L. A. REILLY
Seton Hall University

EDWARD GARGAN
Loyola University, Chicago

CHARLES H. METZGER, S.J.
West Baden College

WALTER W. WILKINSON
Georgetown University

Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1957

ARTICLES

The Moral Laws of History . . . . . *Oscar Halecki* 409

The German Center Party During World War I. An Internal Study . . . . . *John K. Zeender* 441

BOOK REVIEWS 469

NOTES AND COMMENTS 522

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 533

BOOKS RECEIVED 539

GENERAL INDEX i

BOOK REVIEWS

Butler's Lives of the Saints. (Herbert Thurston, S.J., and Donald Attwater, Eds.). ✠ Lawrence J. Shehan 469

The Papacy: A Brief History. (James A. Corbett). Horacio de la Costa 470

Master Alcuin, Liturgist. (Gerald Ellard, S.J.). William Busch 471

La Presqu'ile des caloyers: Le Mont-Athos. (Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta). Anselm Strittmatter 472

Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury. (Avrom Saltman). Marshall W. Baldwin 475

The Letters of John of Salisbury. Volume I. (W. J. Millor, S.J., H. E. Butler, Eds., revised by C. N. L. Brooks). Astrik L. Gabriel 476

St. Francis of Assisi. A Pictorial Biography. (Leonard von Matt and Walter Hauser). Victor E. Mills 478

Saint John Fisher. (E. E. Reynolds). Eric McDermott 479

Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563. (Robert M. Kingdon). Maurice F. Reidy 480

Commentarii Ignatiani: 1556-1956. George J. Undreiner 481

Diplomatic Archive of Chios: 1577-1841. (Philip P. Argenti). Edward Hagemann 482

Martyr in Scotland. Blessed John Ogilvie: His Life and Times. (Thomas Collins). Maurice R. O'Connell. 483

The Archbishop and the Lady. The Story of Fénelon and Madame Guyon. (Michael de la Bedoyere). Florence D. Cohalan 484

Les luttes politiques et doctrinales au XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles. (E. Preclin and E. Jarry). Edward A. Ryan 486

The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A detailed description by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominquez, with Other Contemporary Documents. (Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, Trans. and Eds.). Robert M. Patterson 487

The Last of the Conquistadors. Junipero Serra (1713-1784). (Omer Englebert). John Bernard McGloin 489

God and Caesar in Nebraska. A Study of the Legal Relationship of Church and State, 1854-1954. (Orville H. Zabel). Henry W. Casper 493

Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada. (Franklin A. Walker). William B. Ready 494

The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940. (Paul A. Carter). Aaron I. Abell 495

A Catholic Runs for President: the Campaign of 1928. (Edmund A. Moore). Russell Kirk 497

Christianity in European History. (Herbert Butterfield). *Man On His Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship.* (Herbert Butterfield). M. A. Fitzsimons 499

The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries. (R. R. Bolgar). Martin R. P. McGuire 501

From Alexander to Constantine. Passages and Documents Illustrating the History of Social and Political Ideas, 336 B.C.-A.D. 337. (Ernest Barker, Trans. and Eds.). Thomas A. Brady 503

Harvard Slavic Studies. Volume II. (Horace G. Lunt *et al.*, Eds.). Cyril Toumanoff 504

Feudalism in History. (Rushton Coulborn, Ed.). Richard W. Emery 506

Architectural Symbolism of Imperial Rome and the Middle Ages. (E. Baldwin Smith). James A. Corbett 507

Crusading Warfare (1097-1193): A Contribution to Medieval History. (R. C. Smail). Marshall W. Baldwin 509

Student Life in Ave Maria College. Mediaeval Paris. (Astrik L. Gabriel). Albert C. Shannon 511

Readings and Moots at the Inns of Court in the Fifteenth Century. Volume I. (Samuel E. Thorne, Ed.). Miriam Theresa Rooney 512

Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. (Ruth Kelso). Anna T. Sheedy 513

King James VI and I. (D. Harris Willson). James E. Bunce 514

Charles I and the Puritan Upheaval. A Study of the Causes of the Great Migration. (Allen French). Franklin A. Walker 516

The Royalists During the Puritan Revolution. (Paul H. Hardacre). Carl B. Cone 517

La pace di Milano (6 agosto 1849). (Angelo Filipuzzi) *Tre Profili: Benedetto XIV, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini, Pietro Roselli.* (Emilia Morelli). Elisa A. Carrillo 518

Franco of Spain, A Full-Length Biography. (S. F. A. Coles). Carlton J. H. Hayes 520

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XLII JANUARY, 1957 No. 4

THE MORAL LAWS OF HISTORY

By

Oscar Halecki*

The Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences which met in Rome in September, 1955, was a landmark in the post-war development of the study of history, because for the first time the historians from behind the so-called Iron Curtain joined those of the western world in public discussions. It is true that delegates from the Soviet Union had participated in some international historical congresses before World War II; but this time their contribution was much more conspicuous, they could report on what seemed to be a considerable progress in Marxist historiography, and last but not least, they were accompanied and seconded by delegates from the now Communist controlled countries of East Central Europe which in the past had been in close intellectual community with the West.

It was, of course, the more numerous and active Soviet delegation which was leading the whole Marxist group at the congress in Rome, not without some occasional support from individual western scholars and only exceptionally challenged by dissident Marxists from Yugoslavia. And it was almost exclusively by the Russians that problems of the philosophy of history were raised. The official head of the Soviet delegation, Madame A. Pankratova, reading her paper in the section on "Methodology and General Problems" in which otherwise philosophical issues were not touched at all, started with an analysis

* This paper was originally delivered as the presidential address at the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association in St. Louis, December 29, 1956.

of historicism, and in the second part of her address described the practical application of the Marxist interpretation to the study of contemporary history, especially that of the Soviet Union. Opposing the materialist conception of historicism to what she called the anti-historicism of western historians, sociologists, and philosophers, including the Americans, she briefly stressed the main advantages of the Marxist approach which, she said, is "the possibility of a correct understanding of the laws of historical development and of their utilization for a solution of the actual problems of the contemporary period."[1]

The same idea was submitted to the Roman congress in much more detail by A. L. Sidorov, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, who prepared a comprehensive report on the main problems and achievements of Soviet historiography,[2] raising a discussion which lasted four hours. What interested most the various speakers from both West and East was not the bibliographical survey included in the report, but the long introduction which was a spirited defense of the historical materialism of the Marxist school, in opposition to "feudal and bourgeois" historiography.

Speaking in Rome soon after the Geneva Conference of July, 1955, Sidorov, even when replying to his critics, wanted to appear as conciliatory as possible. He started by assuring that the Soviet historians did not reject at all the factual material discovered by non-Marxist research workers, and he concluded with an appeal for international co-operation among all historians in the interest of world peace. But he admitted that Soviet historiography was fighting against two dangers. The first of them is, in his opinion, a merely empirical study of individual facts, their simple description without any generalization, based upon the belief that the historical phenomena cannot be repeated and upon theories which deny the possibility of grasping the laws of social development. He warned no less emphatically against the opposite danger which would consist in replacing the concrete material by an abstract, schematical treatment, thus reducing history to some kind of sociology. And in that connection he recalled the condemnation of the Pokrovsky school which had "sinned" by such a "scholastic" approach. It was clear, how-

[1] *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* (Roma, 1955), "Riasunti delle communicazioni," VII, 48.

[2] *Ibid.*, "Relazioni generali," VI, 389-456.

ever, that the spokesman of the orthodox Marxist school who, in the fall of 1955, still quoted Stalin along with Lenin, as well as Marx and Engels, was particularly anxious to emphasize and to defend the fundamental principle of historical materialism concerning the laws which govern all history. "The materialistically thinking historian," he said,[3] "deals with objective laws of social development, independent of man's desire and will." He distinguished between two categories of such laws, one of them influencing the whole history of mankind, the other acting under specific social conditions and changing with the changes in such conditions. But both of them "reflect the real historical process, based upon the development of social production, the production of the material goods necessary for human existence."

There was nothing new in Sidorov's first comment which was to meet the objection that such an approach would disregard the variety of not only social but also political and cultural life. He simply repeated the well known, rather tiresome Marxist distinction between the political and ideological "superstructure" and the "real basis" represented by the conditions of production and the economic order of society. But then he made a special effort to explain that the opponents of historical materialism are wrong, if not consciously prejudiced, when they accuse the Marxists of a "fatalistic"—he avoided the term "deterministic"—interpretation of history. Considering this a misunderstanding, Sidorov recalled that Marx and Engels had already emphasized time and again "that the objective laws of historical development do not act directly as a fate or destiny dominating man." And he pointed out that these social laws of history are, indeed, different from the laws of nature, because in contradistinction to the latter, they manifest themselves "through the activity of men, of the classes, of the popular masses which are the real creators of history."[4]

That subtle distinction seemed, however, much less clear than the simple formula which, according to the Soviet historian, would summarize the whole historical process. In spite of all its variety, that process is considered a succession of economic forms of society in the following order: original community, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism. These are, in general, the progressive phases of evolution of all mankind. They might have specific features in individual coun-

[3] *Ibid.*, VI, 394.

[4] *Ibid.*, VI, 395.

of historicism, and in the second part of her address described the practical application of the Marxist interpretation to the study of contemporary history, especially that of the Soviet Union. Opposing the materialist conception of historicism to what she called the anti-historicism of western historians, sociologists, and philosophers, including the Americans, she briefly stressed the main advantages of the Marxist approach which, she said, is "the possibility of a correct understanding of the laws of historical development and of their utilization for a solution of the actual problems of the contemporary period."[1]

The same idea was submitted to the Roman congress in much more detail by A. L. Sidorov, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, who prepared a comprehensive report on the main problems and achievements of Soviet historiography,[2] raising a discussion which lasted four hours. What interested most the various speakers from both West and East was not the bibliographical survey included in the report, but the long introduction which was a spirited defense of the historical materialism of the Marxist school, in opposition to "feudal and bourgeois" historiography.

Speaking in Rome soon after the Geneva Conference of July, 1955, Sidorov, even when replying to his critics, wanted to appear as conciliatory as possible. He started by assuring that the Soviet historians did not reject at all the factual material discovered by non-Marxist research workers, and he concluded with an appeal for international co-operation among all historians in the interest of world peace. But he admitted that Soviet historiography was fighting against two dangers. The first of them is, in his opinion, a merely empirical study of individual facts, their simple description without any generalization, based upon the belief that the historical phenomena cannot be repeated and upon theories which deny the possibility of grasping the laws of social development. He warned no less emphatically against the opposite danger which would consist in replacing the concrete material by an abstract, schematical treatment, thus reducing history to some kind of sociology. And in that connection he recalled the condemnation of the Pokrovsky school which had "sinned" by such a "scholastic" approach. It was clear, how-

[1] *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* (Roma, 1955), "Riasunti delle communicazioni," VII, 48.

[2] *Ibid.*, "Relazioni generali," VI, 389-456.

ever, that the spokesman of the orthodox Marxist school who, in the fall of 1955, still quoted Stalin along with Lenin, as well as Marx and Engels, was particularly anxious to emphasize and to defend the fundamental principle of historical materialism concerning the laws which govern all history. "The materialistically thinking historian," he said,[3] "deals with objective laws of social development, independent of man's desire and will." He distinguished between two categories of such laws, one of them influencing the whole history of mankind, the other acting under specific social conditions and changing with the changes in such conditions. But both of them "reflect the real historical process, based upon the development of social production, the production of the material goods necessary for human existence."

There was nothing new in Sidorov's first comment which was to meet the objection that such an approach would disregard the variety of not only social but also political and cultural life. He simply repeated the well known, rather tiresome Marxist distinction between the political and ideological "superstructure" and the "real basis" represented by the conditions of production and the economic order of society. But then he made a special effort to explain that the opponents of historical materialism are wrong, if not consciously prejudiced, when they accuse the Marxists of a "fatalistic"—he avoided the term "deterministic"—interpretation of history. Considering this a misunderstanding, Sidorov recalled that Marx and Engels had already emphasized time and again "that the objective laws of historical development do not act directly as a fate or destiny dominating man." And he pointed out that these social laws of history are, indeed, different from the laws of nature, because in contradistinction to the latter, they manifest themselves "through the activity of men, of the classes, of the popular masses which are the real creators of history."[4]

That subtle distinction seemed, however, much less clear than the simple formula which, according to the Soviet historian, would summarize the whole historical process. In spite of all its variety, that process is considered a succession of economic forms of society in the following order: original community, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism. These are, in general, the progressive phases of evolution of all mankind. They might have specific features in individual coun-

[3] *Ibid.*, VI, 394.

[4] *Ibid.*, VI, 395.

tries, as even Lenin admitted, and there are periods of transition from one stage to the next, these transitions being "as a rule" of revolutionary character. The future always belongs to the new phase and to its "higher" means of production, and the old which "stubbornly" tries to hold its positions, is unavoidably defeated in that struggle.[5] That bloody revolutions are likewise unavoidable, was not stated by Sidorov in so many words, but it was openly admitted in the discussion by another delegate, Madame E. Stepanova, in reply to the question of a western historian who wanted to meet the Marxists halfway.

Strangely enough, the spokesmen of the non-Russian countries under Communist rule, while praising on every possible occasion the achievements of Soviet historiography and its helpful influence on their own, did not enter into these discussions about the philosophical interpretation and the political application of history. Both the brief paper by E. Andics on Hungarian historiography[6] and the detailed report by B. Lesnodorski on Polish historiography[7], describing in either case the progress of Sovietization and of Marxist methods during the last ten years, seemed to avoid these theoretical and practical implications of the new trends, although they duly acknowledged the support received from the Communist Party and pointed out the shortcomings of non-Marxist historians in the field of methodology. If, however, on the international stage the presentation of the purely doctrinal aspects and their connection with the requirements of our time are apparently left to the best trained and most reliable Russian experts, their foremost agents in the captive countries are at the same time systematically indoctrinating the native historians in the orthodox philosophy of history, and are quite outspoken in making them aware of their new social and political responsibilities.

A special effort in that respect is being made in Poland where the historical sciences had always been particularly well developed, and the tradition, not only of the nation at large, but also of its historiography, had been particularly different from and opposed to the Marxist ideology. The best example of that pressure is a book[8]

[5] *Ibid.*, VI, 397-399.

[6] *Ibid.*, "Riasunti delle communicazioni," VII, 58-66.

[7] *Ibid.*, "Relazioni generali," VI, 457-515.

[8] Adam Schaff, *Obiektywny charakter praw historii* [The Objective Character of the Laws of History] (Warsaw, 1955).

which was published in Warsaw, in Polish, only a few months before the French collection of the papers prepared for the Rome Congress[9]. Before being printed, the typescript was submitted twice for discussion and criticism to the Institute of Social Sciences attached to the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers, i.e., Communist Party, with the participation of leading philosophers and historians, the author himself, Adam Schaff, being one of the former. The book, therefore, must be considered a fully authentic expression of the Communist doctrine in the historical field, as dictated by the party and hence by Moscow.

Before, however, examining that expression, the question has to be answered whether that volume written more than two years ago and published last year, can still be considered authentic and orthodox in 1956. This raises, in one specific field of unquestionable importance, the whole issue of de-Stalinization, of what is rather misleadingly called "the thaw," a symbolic term coined by the Soviet Russian writer Ilia Ehrenburg and thoughtlessly accepted by the West. What that apparent retreat of Communism, by no means the first one, really is in the field of historiography is again best shown by a Polish example. A group of Marxist historians have written a new comprehensive survey of Polish history, the first two volumes extending from the origins to 1764[10]. But before their publication in final form they were printed in a provisional edition which was submitted, just like Schaff's book, to discussion and criticism, this time mainly by professional historians both from Poland and from the other countries of the Soviet orbit. Most of that discussion was recently printed in the *Polish Historical Review*[11], along with an article by W. Kula, one of the country's most decidedly Communist historians, on post-war Poland's policies regarding the study and writing of history.

At first glance it could seem that the criticism of the Marxist outline, sometimes surprisingly sincere and severe, as well as Kula's

[9] *La Pologne au X^e congrès international des sciences historiques à Rome* (Warsaw 1955). Cf. the writer's review of both books in the *American Historical Review*, LXI (July, 1956), 972-973.

[10] Henry Lowmianski (Ed.), *Historia Polski* (Warsaw, 1955). Cf. the review by Basil Dmytryshyn in the *American Historical Review*, LXII (October, 1956), 139-141.

[11] *Kwartalnik historyczny*, LXIII (1956).

approach, based upon the statement that the policy of the "strong hand" begun in 1948 had ended in 1952, was a welcome evidence of some kind of liberalization which would appear in historiography as part of a general process. Did not Kula himself ridicule those who did not take the new course seriously enough and consider it sufficient to replace quotations from Stalin with quotations from Lenin?[12] But in the immediately following paragraph he issued a quite serious, indeed, a stern warning that the revision of Marxist history writing which he recommended did not mean at all any retreat from the basic Marxist positions nor any relaxation in the struggle against what still remained of liberal, bourgeois methods and interpretations. Why changes in the Marxist presentation, especially corrections of factual errors, of obvious exaggerations, and of clumsy style, are considered necessary, was best explained in the discussion of the new survey by K. Lepszy, a scholar of excellent pre-war training, when he warned that if the Marxist texts were not perfect, students would continue to use in addition to them the old texts of the capitalistic period.[13] And if concessions to Polish patriotism are suggested, admitting that not everything was dark in the nation's pre-Communist past, they seem inspired, not by any genuine respect for the national tradition, but by the earlier example of Soviet Russian historiography when Pokrovsky's extreme views were rejected in order to use Russian nationalism for Communist goals.

Such a perfectionism, dictated by expediency, makes the Marxist impact on the historiography of any country even more efficient and dangerous. It may be that in a new edition of Schaff's book Stalin will not only disappear from the footnotes and the bibliography, but even cease to be a great historian; it may be, too, that at another meeting of the Communist Party improvements of the author's argumentation will be outlined. Yet this will not change at all, but only serve to make more persuasive the basic ideas of a book which is supposed to be only the first part of a treatise of what is called "the problem of truth and of its objectivity in the science of history." That truth will remain the Marxist dogma and its objectivity depend on the Communist Party's interest, exactly as it is in the present volume.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*

That in this volume—an introduction to the methodological problems of Marxist historiography, as explained in the subtitle—the laws of history and their objective character received special attention, is highly instructive and leads us back to the statements made with special emphasis by the Soviet Russian historians at the international congress in Rome. In both cases it clearly appeared that what, in the opinion of the Marxist historians, most decisively distinguishes them from all the others, from the "bourgeois" to whatever school they may belong, is the approach to the old controversial issue of the laws of history, their existence and character. But Schaff's treatment of that controversy is not only much more detailed than in the Congress papers, and not only much more aggressive and polemical, devoting one half of the volume to a sharp, devastating criticism of bourgeois historiography; it is much more outspoken in stressing the consequences of the Marxist conception of these laws not only for the research work of scholars, but also for the contemporary struggle of the classes and for the interests of the classes which participate in that struggle.

This does not mean that the outcome of that struggle might depend on the theories regarding the laws of history. For the convinced Marxist that outcome is not subject to the slightest doubt. Following Lenin, Schaff praises Marx not only for his scholarly achievement of having discovered the laws of the evolution of the history of mankind, but also for having given to the proletariat full certainty of victory. For, on the one hand, the discovery of these laws permits one to foresee scientifically the trends of social development and thus scientifically to organize the strategy and the tactics of the working class; and on the other hand, these same laws act against the bourgeoisie and its interest, since their "objective" trend is directed against bourgeois supremacy and since the awareness of that "fact" demoralizes the bourgeois camp.[14]

Schaff does not at all try to conceal, as Sidorov attempted to do in Rome, that historical materialism is consistently deterministic. On the contrary, on the very first page of his book, he proudly opposes that determinism to the fideism of those who believe in God (never written with a capital 'g'). However, he explains in the concluding chapter that the certainty of an ultimate victory of socialism over capitalism does not include an equal certainty as to the time

[14] Schaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

of that victory nor the ways and means of achieving it in all individual cases. Quoting besides Stalin, who so strongly emphasized the possibility of an initial victory of socialism in one country only, similar statements of Lenin about the interplay of necessity and possibility, of certainty and chance in the historical process, Schaff wants the Marxist historian to be fully conscious of his responsibility in that respect.[15] By studying history and by correctly interpreting all past experiences the scholar who does not limit himself to a mere description of historical events can and must help the workers and their party not to take any chances of delay or costly efforts. He must hasten the day of total victory, find and grasp the main lines in the chain of evolution, pass rapidly and smoothly from one phase of that evolution to the next, and thus prepare the final triumph. It is for that reason that "the theoretical struggle in the field of the problems of the laws of history . . . is, after all, an integral part and an element of the great class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the struggle which embraces the whole life of contemporary society."[16]

The success of that appeal to the captive historians, an appeal—or rather an order—which is summarized in the last sentence of the book, will depend on the question whether these historians will be really convinced that Marx has discovered the unquestionable and inescapable laws of history, leaving to his theoretical and practical followers only the responsibility of watching the details of their realization. Whether Schaff, in the rather brief first part of his book, has succeeded in convincing his readers that "Marxism has for the first time made history a science,"[17] might be decided by the partisans of that school of thought. For its opponents, something else is of much greater interest. They ought to realize that the outcome of the theoretical struggle, of the *bellum historicorum*, which has been described—and, indeed, quite convincingly—as part of the basic struggle of our time, will depend on the achievements of that non-Marxist historiography which he calls bourgeois and which, unwillingly, he might also make conscious of its responsibilities.

He is obviously unjust in suspecting that historiography of denying the "objective" laws of history only because they are threatening their vested class interest.[18] But it is only fair to recognize that his

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 383.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

lengthy criticism of the non-Marxist approach to the problem of these laws is not altogether unjustified and rather instructive. He is correct, first, in distinguishing among the non-Marxists two different attitudes in that matter and criticizing separately those who simply do not admit the existence of any laws in the field of history and those who, on the contrary, try to discover themselves such laws entirely different from those allegedly discovered by Marx. And it was not too difficult for Schaff to reveal unquestionable weaknesses in both schools.

The criticism of what Schaff calls "idiographism" in history, starting from Windelband's well known distinction between idiographic sciences which deal with individual events and nomothetic sciences which deal with established laws,[19] is now general in the Communist controlled countries. It serves to discredit those historians who try to remain outside the ideological struggle by simply describing past events according to Ranke's famous formula, without taking into consideration the problem of any laws. To western and Polish scholars guilty of such a limitation Schaff always opposes the shining examples of Soviet Russian historians interested in the same topics. But the choice of his two main victims is highly significant. One of them is F. Znaniecki[20], a Pole particularly well known and highly appreciated in the United States, a sociologist who agrees with those historians who oppose their own method to those of the nomothetic sciences, and who warns against the illusion that predetermined laws can explain the whole social evolution. His position seems to the Marxist more dangerous than any "fideistic," that is Catholic, philosophy of history, which is dismissed as exercising "no special influence on historiography."[21] However, the desire is particularly strong to discredit a professional historian of leftist, originally socialist, opinions who undoubtedly exercized such an influence in Poland, and who also enjoyed great prestige in western Europe, especially in France, M. Handelsman,[22] who died shortly before the end of the war in a German concentration camp.

Handelsman's former students are now at pains to vindicate his progressive views,[23] and one of them, who edited posthumously his

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 159-164.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 158.
[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 165-181.
[23] Wanda Moszczenska in *Kwartalnik historyczny*, LXIII (1956).

biography of Prince Adam Czartoryski, tried hard to justify the author of such a monograph in which the "hero" is apparently isolated from the social classes, by claiming that Handelsman "otherwise held the opinion that not the lives and deeds of great men, but the broad social processes constitute the real sense of history."[24] Nevertheless, these four volumes which, as admitted, are full of erudition and written with great literary skill, are considered a distortion of historical truth and "a threatening memento of the dangers of idiographism," while the younger generation is invited to use Handelsman's material for a new synthesis of Czartoryski's time based upon Marxist methodology. It so happened, however, that in the very year when Schaff's criticism was published such a new synthesis was given by an exiled Polish historian, M. Kukiel, who succeeded perfectly in showing the significance of Czartoryski's activities for the general problem of European unity,[25] although being under even less influence of Marxist methodology than Handelsman, and not being concerned with the discovery of any laws of social evolution.

There were, indeed, in practically all times and places many non-Marxists who were very much concerned with the discovery of such laws, and all of them, different as they were in their respective approaches, arrived at conclusions so remote from historical materialism that they contradict the Marxist claim of having established once and for all laws of history which are definite and objective. Hence one finds a special hostility against those who question and endanger the Marxist monopoly in the philosophical interpretation of history and are accused of an "idealistic mystification" regarding history's laws.[26]

The critique of that second "bourgeois" school is again a general phenomenon in all countries under Communist rule, although again in Poland it seemed particularly necessary in view of an old and widely spread interest of pre-Marxist Polish thought in "historiosophy." Whatever we may think of that term, or even of the term philosophy of history which is also, to a certain extent, discredited

[24] Stefan Kieniewicz in his introduction to Handlesman's *Adam Czartoryski* (Warsaw, 1948), I, 9-10; cf. the comments by Schaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

[25] Marian Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity, 1770-1861* (Princeton, 1955).

[26] Schaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 187 ff.

and rather carefully avoided in the western world where it has been replaced by more modest expressions like a synthesis or study of history, such an interest is well understandable. For it is undoubtedly true that the mere description of what really happened in the past does not fully satisfy the human mind, that it creates a real danger of leaving too much authority to what Voltaire called "sa Majesté le hazard," and can easily lead to an antiquarian collecting of details which could make all history seem irrelevant. The fact that precisely so many Poles, though publicists rather than scholarly historians, went too far in the opposite direction of bold speculations, is understandable in view of the desire to find in the interpretation of history a comforting explanation of the nation's tragic destinies.

Even in Poland, however, the Marxist criticism of any such "bourgeois" philosophies of history has to begin with Hegel,[27] precisely because dialectical materialism owes so much to the idealistic dialectic of the famous German philosopher. To prove today that Hegel, once so influential both west and east of Germany, was wrong in his belief that he had discovered the real laws of history, is very easy and, therefore, offers a convenient start. On the other hand, Hegel's obvious failure ought to be a serious warning against admitting any similar pretension, especially when it is based, as in the case of Marx, on a completely one-sided approach to a problem of universal character and on a knowledge, were it even remarkable, of only one aspect of history: the economic, an aspect which only recently, thanks to the Industrial Revolution, gained an unusual although, perhaps, only transitory importance.

It is no less easy to demonstrate all that is arbitrary and artificial in the theories of a cyclical development of history which started in Antiquity, were Christianized by Vico,[28] and have tempted many modern minds, although hardly, if ever, those of professional experts. Nor would anybody today defend the interpretations of Oswald Spengler whose pessimistic determinism is no more convincing than the allegedly optimistic Marxist. Much more timely is the discus-

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 191-212.

[28] The place of Vico in the tradition of universal history was recently examined by Friedrich Engel-Janosi in the symposium on Toynbee held at Loyola University, Chicago, in November, 1955. Cf. "The Loyola Toynbee Symposium" by Edward T. Gargan in *Mid-America*, XXXVIII (April, 1956), 71.

sion of Arnold Toynbee's ideas,[29] a discussion which, however, as conducted by the Marxists,[30] is even more unfair than the most violent attacks against the British historian which are being made in the free world. If the same scholar who is accused of a "lie about the West"[31] because he is obviously exaggerating in his denunciation of western self-centeredness and aggression, is considered by Soviet controlled historiography an agent of western capitalistic imperialism, it is, first, because of his spiritual and religious interpretation of history, and secondly, because his study of history comes nearest, in our generation, to that philosophy of history which the Marxists wish to regard as their exclusive domain.

No less easy than pointing out the contradictions between the various "bourgeois" systems of philosophical interpretations of history, whether positivistic or idealistic, is the almost triumphant demonstration by the Communists that in contradistinction to Marxism all these "hostile ideologies" have, after all, exercised a rather limited influence upon the concrete progress of historical research and writing. Among the Polish historians not only the "bourgeois" nationalists but even those who long before the artificial Sovietization recognized the importance of economic and social history are found wanting; they necessarily "stopped half way" because of their "ideological and political limitations." They are, therefore, used as one more warning example that "without dialectical and historical materialism the problem of the scientific character of historiography is insolvable."[32] That neither of these distinguished scholars, F. Bujak or K. Tymieniecki, in spite of an occasional interest in synthetic generalizations, even tried to develop a new system of philosophy of history is, of course, another question which is conveniently overlooked by their Marxist critics.

[29] Cf., e.g., the thirty-two critical essays and reviews edited by M. F. Ashley Montagu in *Toynbee and History* (Boston, 1956), where the contributions of Pieter Geyl and Abba Eban are particularly hostile to Toynbee.

[30] In a series of articles directed against "hostile ideologies" in *Kwartalnik historyczny*, LX (1953), Toynbee was chosen as the prime target (pp. 181-191), while the American interpreters of the Renaissance and the present writer came next.

[31] The quarrel between Toynbee and Douglas Jerrold, who published an essay under that title, was examined at the Loyola symposium by John K. Lukacs; cf. *Mid-America*, XXXVIII (April, 1956), 73.

[32] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

The entire second school of "bourgeois" historiography, which is wrongly blamed for a "mystification" regarding the laws of history and for its ideological and political motives, could be blamed rather for not having succeeded in its very honest and sometimes inspiring endeavors to make history something more than a mere collection of dates and names and to make the study of history more scientific. Quite recently, when in an international discussion the question was raised whether the ancient humanistic heritage still has a lasting value for the contemporary world, a French scholar in the field of Antiquity, Jean Bayet, made a provocative distinction between what he called "le passé historié et le passé fondamental."[33] The first of his qualifications, difficult to translate into English, reminded his mostly French-speaking audience of all that Henri Berr, the leader of the French movement for a truly scientific historical synthesis, had said during the last generation against the "histoire historisante," frequently quoting the famous saying "Il n'y a de science que le général."[34] It is true that the professional historian could not help remembering at the same time, that in so many volumes of the impressive series of a new synthetic world history, ably edited by Henri Berr, the old "histoire historisante" reclaimed its right and only the editor's introduction integrated the wealth of facts and figures collected and described in the author's text with the general vision of the "evolution of mankind."[35]

Yet, Bayet's appeal to turn to the fundamentals of the past undoubtedly deserves to be followed, the question being, however, how to do it. Already in the movement for historical synthesis, a movement which later significantly dropped the adjective "historique" in the title of its center and of its review, there was a trend to assimilate the historical sciences to the exact or natural sciences, which in the terminology of most western languages, are the sciences *par excellence,* and to request from any serious historian an adequate knowledge of many related fields which are no longer historical and

[33] His lecture on "L'héritage méditerranéen: sa survie nécessaire et ses conditions d'usage" will appear in the next volume (1956) of the series *Rencontres internationales de Genève.*

[34] It first appeared in his well known work, *La synthèse en histoire* (Paris, 1911).

[35] A collection of Berr's introductions to the various volumes of *L'évolution de l'humanité* appeared in a special series entitled *En marge de l'histoire universelle.*

are normally explored by other sciences. In France that trend is now even more conspicuous in the group of historians who in close co-operation with other specialists, particularly economists and sociologists, contribute to the review *Les Annales*, and Fernand Braudel's treatment of the Mediterranean problem in the later sixteenth century is frequently given as a typical example.[36] American historians will remember, however, that a similar trend in this country, known as the "New History" movement was certainly not an unqualified success and was gradually abandoned, since it rather turned away the student of history from what is really fundamental in his own field.

But what is fundamental in the study of man's past? That a knowledge of the facts, even of a political, diplomatic, and military nature, including the so-called "histoire-bataille," is a prerequisite condition, can hardly be denied. In a convincing defense of apparently old-fashioned political history Sir Charles Webster,[37] now one of the leading British scholars in that field, opposed at the International Congress of Historical Sciences at Paris in 1950 those who, without being Marxists, one-sidedly overstressed the importance of economic and social history which, after being long neglected, was now taking its revenge, even at the expense of cultural history. On the other hand, it must be admitted that in all these special divisions and subdivisions of history, which after all is one, the knowledge of the most important facts is at present, thanks to the tremendous progress of research especially in the last one hundred years, so well advanced, that the claim for something more, the quest for the basic core within the framework of more or less spectacular events, the desire to discover not the accessories but the very sense of history, are more urgent and justified than ever before. And it would seem that the discovery of the laws of history would be, to speak with Arnold Toynbee, the best response to that challenge.

Toynbee has, indeed, included the problem of these laws in the almost infinite variety of questions which he treated in *A Study of History*. But he who so often is misleadingly compared with Oswald

[36] For a critique of that trend cf. Gerhard Ritter's report on the recent achievements in the field of modern history in *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche*, VI, 297-304.

[37] His remarks are only briefly summarized in *IX^e Congrès international des sciences historiques*, "Actes," II, 244 ff.

Spengler, was quick to realize the danger of determinism inherent in all conceptions of historical laws similar to the laws of nature. In one of the last volumes of his work Toynbee has, therefore, examined the eternal question of the relationship between law and freedom in history.[38] If he has not solved it, it is because in his definition of the term "law," rightly distinguishing between "man made legislation" and the laws of nature which really are the laws of God, he has failed to distinguish between those laws which God has given to nature and those which He has given to man. Only the former are inexorable necessities which are followed automatically and, therefore, without any possibility of disobeying nor any merit in obeying them. The latter, on the other hand, similar in that respect to the man-made laws, are orders which even when issued by the highest possible authority and by powers with ability to enforce them, still can be and practically are disregarded and disobeyed by many, even at the price of severe punishment.

It is not difficult to discover to which of these categories the laws of history belong. Furthermore, even if we would admit, as not only the Marxists but also the rationalistic interpreters of history admit *a priori*, that there is some immanent logic in the historical process, the most elementary empirical method of observation, which in our field replaces the experimental method of the natural sciences, would give ample evidence that the logical development of that process is all the time interrupted and distorted by the countless accidents of birth and death. Taking at random any such example, as that recently given in a highly special study of the relations between Europe and the Mongols in the thirteenth century,[39] the objective historian has a right to conclude that "those who think it possible to neglect the role of the individuals in the development of the historical process will have matter for reflection" when considering the consequences of the sudden passing away of this or that ruler even in a distant part of the world.

No wonder, then, that the irrational and unpredictable element of pure chance is, consciously or not, introduced into so many interpretations of history, the only other possible explanation being that

[38] *A Study of History*, IX, 167-405; cf. in particular the "definitions of terms," pp. 168-173.

[39] Denis Sinor, "Les relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort d' Arghoun et de Béla IV," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III (1956), 50-51.

the historical destinies of mankind are influenced or even directed by some force which without any apparent logic interferes with the normal course of events. It was only natural that from time immemorial the human mind should have been looking for that force beyond the visible and tangible field of observation, and whether the fate of the individual or of any community was concerned, explained that interference and direction with the help of religion. Such was the attitude of the earliest historians in both pre-Christian and Christian times, and it was only in what is called, not without pessimistic exaggeration, the post-Christian world of secularism, that such an attitude used to be considered unscientific. Yet, it was none other than Lenin himself who rightly observed that as soon as the laws—meaning, of course, laws in the sense of necessities such as the laws of nature—are eliminated from the field of science, the laws of religion are "smuggled in."[40]

However, even Christian scholars of modern times who did not hesitate to refer occasionally to divine Providence, usually preferred to replace any laws of history by a rather vague concept of ideas. The case of Leopold von Ranke is typical in that respect, and again it is not too difficult for the convinced Marxist[41] to point out that any such "idealism" did not lead much farther than the merely idiographical approach to history. This does not mean that the study of the role of ideas in the historical process has not attained very real progress if compared with the rather mechanical listing of events. Because of the progress which had been made in the knowledge of the events themselves, the next step appeared to be the more abstract and unquestionably deeper study of the general ideas which appear behind these events and seem so much more interesting to later generations. It was for that good reason that at the historical congress of 1955 in Rome such a large part of the program, this time well planned in advance, was devoted not to the factual but to the ideological aspects of at least some of the selected problems. Thus, e.g., in view of the many recent publications which described not without unavoidable repetition, once more the course of the Crusades, it was not these expeditions as such but the crusading idea[42]

[40] Significantly quoted by Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 187 ff.

[42] *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche*, "Storia del medioevo," III, 543 ff.

that was suggested as a topic of discussion. Similarly in the modern field, instead of reviewing again the largely known facts of the religious crisis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the idea of the Church in these centuries[43] was analyzed in the introductory reports of what otherwise would have been called a session on the history of the Protestant Revolt and the Catholic Reformation.

Even this is a sound reaction against not only the "histoire historisante," but also, though rather unintentionally, against the Marxist doctrine. It becomes clear that far from being a "superstructure," or a part of it along with politics, the ideas are a basis, if not *the* basis, of the historical process of which, contrary again to the Marxist dogma, economics are the superstructure and, therefore, when overemphasized, lead to a very superficial interpretation of history. Yet the question is still left open as to whether there are any laws governing the origin and development of historical ideas and, if so, to what extent they limit man's free initiative and decision. Furthermore, there appears at the same time the hardly less exciting question as to whether or not the historian, as a scholar, should make judgments of value. Strangely enough, the Marxists who deny the basic significance of ideas, although they owe their own power to the appeal of a relentlessly propagandized idea, are likewise inconsistent in that other matter: though their whole philosophy seems to recognize the material values of production only, they blame the bourgeois historians, not without good reason but without much logic, for evading judgments of value in their detached descriptions of the facts and even in their synthesis.

There is a great deal of truth in these charges, because the laws of history which are opposed to those allegedly discovered by Marx are usually also conceived as fatal necessities which predetermine the course of history and practically exclude any human freedom and hence any value of human actions and any reason for judgments. It is, therefore, high time to introduce, or rather to reintroduce, into our interpretation of history the concept of laws of an entirely different category, laws which in their application depend on man's free will.

These laws, or rather elements of order, have only to be reintroduced because, as a matter of fact they were originally the main and

[43] *Ibid.*, "Storia moderna," IV, 57 ff.

permanent concern of Christian and even of any religious historiography. The belief in these laws, though rather naively expressed and not void of primitive elements of superstition, inspired the humblest mediaeval chronicler. The question of the relation between such laws, having God as their source and divine omnipotence as their sanction, and the free will of man was ever present in the Christian philosophy of history from St. Augustine to the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. And so was the question to what extent these laws were the same in the life of the individual and in universal history. This second question, were it only in a secularized form, remained vital and an object of endless disputes and misinterpretations, even when the religious origin of the problem was already completely obscured or at least disregarded.

It is frequently said, and practically taken for granted, that Bossuet was the last to represent fully and unreservedly the traditional Catholic interpretation of history as a development under the law of God. But while the famous Bishop of Meaux's real greatness and his rightful place in the history of historiography is recognized even today from an international point of view,[44] it must be admitted, even from the Catholic point of view, that, the progress of historical scholarship accomplished after Bossuet's day made his method, information, and presentation definitely antiquated. And though Catholics always participated in and contributed to that scholarly progress, they were rather slow to take a leading part in the great debate about historical synthesis and to adapt their perennial philosophy of history to the requirements of modern times.

Today, at last, that situation is definitely improving. The name of Christopher Dawson[45] must, of course, be mentioned in the first place. His tireless efforts to show the intimate relationship between religion and culture in general, and in particular the role of Catholicism in the making of Europe during the first millennium of our era are, indeed, leading the minds of all scholars, whatever their beliefs

[44] Cf. the reference to Bossuet in the letter of President Carneiro to the director general of UNESCO, in the *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, I (1953), 222, published by UNESCO; but also the critical remarks about Bossuet in the last statement of the editor, L. Febvre [III (1956), 15].

[45] Bruno P. Schlesinger, *Christopher Dawson and the Modern Political Crisis* (Notre Dame, 1949) has studied Dawson's political philosophy, but his philosophy of history has not yet been systematically analyzed.

may be, to a consideration of the fundamentals of the past and to a recognition that the Catholic interpretation of that past deserves serious attention. But neither the outstanding British historian and philosopher, nor the Swiss Gonzague de Reynold[46] working in the same direction, with special interest in the formation of Europe as accomplished more than a thousand years ago, have up to the present undertaken the difficult and responsible task of opposing real laws of history, in agreement with the Christian doctrine, to the pretentious claims that these laws have been discovered by Marx. De Reynold prefers to speak about "les lignes de force" or "les constantes de l'histoire," and we have to wait for the appearance of the last volume of his great work, the concluding volume on Europe's "Christian roof," fully to understand what he means by these terms. Similarly, "the great currents of universal history" which the Belgian historian of our generation, Jacques Pirenne,[47] after starting with painstaking research in the early civilization of Egypt, is following down to the present, can certainly contribute to the discovery of the laws of history in the Christian sense; but as yet they remain only a precious guide through the ever growing material he is trying to organize.

Would it, perhaps, help in arriving at this discovery which seems more and more urgent, if two preliminary considerations, two closely connected qualifications of what we might call the laws of history, were submitted to the attention of Catholic historians? First, it ought to be kept in mind that any laws of history, while intrinsically different from the laws of nature, must be considered part of the natural law. It is hardly necessary to point out that this law, which is at present being carefully studied in the United States,[48] belongs to the second of the two categories of laws as distinguished above, not being a necessity imposed upon man as a part of nature, but an order given him by his Creator which leaves to his free will the decision of obeying it or not. In contradistinction, however, to orders given by human authorities such, e.g., as are given by the state under its constitution,

[46] Cf. the collection of essays in his honor entitled *Gonzague de Reynold et son oeuvre* (Fribourg, 1955).

[47] The work on *Les grands courants de l'histoire universelle* which the son of Henri Pirenne began publishing in 1945 has now reached the seventh volume.

[48] Particularly by the Natural Law Institute at the University of Notre Dame which upon its inauguration in 1947 began publishing the annual volumes of its *Proceedings*.

or even by the international community in the matter of interstate relations—all of great interest to the historian but dependent on specific conditions of space and time—the truly unique law which is called natural because of its universal character has been directly established by God Himself and is, therefore, naturally binding for all His creatures, always and everywhere, in the private life of the individual and in the historical development of society.

Theoretically, this is, indeed, recognized by all Catholics, by all Christians, by all who really believe in God. There is, however, a most unfortunate inclination to introduce some rather arbitrary limitations into the concrete application of the natural law. Contrary to the teaching of the Church from St. Augustine through St. Thomas Aquinas to Pius XII,[49] there are even Catholics who are doubtful whether the general rules of natural law are really valid and binding in international affairs, in the relations between sovereign states and national communities. To remove such doubt, is, of course, a prerequisite condition for recognizing that natural law is the law of history also, of universal as well as of national, and of political as well as of economic or social history.

The source of any doubts in that matter leads to the second qualification of the laws of history as seen from the religious point of view. Those who consider it unrealistic to extend the rule of natural law to the international field are influenced by the dissociation of politics from ethics which was so strongly recommended, as unavoidable and natural, by Machiavelli at the threshold of the age of secularism, but appeared quite frequently even before him and has been more and more pronounced ever since. And since an important aspect of history, especially if approached from the non-Marxist point of view, is the political, the conclusion of such a "realistic" attitude is that history, too, remains to a large extent outside the sphere of natural law. One says to a large extent because it is again the non-Marxist who so frequently shares, although for different reasons, the opinion that economics also has nothing to do with ethics, according to the formula of economic liberalism, "laissez faire." This last opinion has been formally condemned in the social encyclicals of the popes along with the Marxist doctrine. Many Catholics who have been slow to realize this truth in all its implications have been and

[49] O. Halecki, "The Natural Law and International Affairs Today," *Fordham Law Review*, XXIII (March, 1954), 1-12.

still are even slower to recognize the implications of the doctrine of the Church in international relations, so eloquently recalled and so fully developed by Pius XII with special concern for the unprecedented gravity of the problems of peace in our time.[50] As a consequence it is understandable that even among Catholics there is a certain reluctance to realize that the only laws of history which offer a real key to an understanding of the past are not only part of the universal natural law, but are exactly as that law itself, of a moral character.

Without saying it in so many words, Toynbee, in his speculations on law and freedom, has made a decisive contribution to that awareness and a step in the right direction. After noting that sometimes even the immutable and inexorable laws of nature, laws in the sense of physical necessities, can be controlled by man or at least their incidence affected,[51] he attained in his conclusion one of those inspiring vistas which compensate his Catholic readers for many disappointments or even shocking impressions. For he did not hesitate to say that the law of God which the human soul has to face in the course of history is a law of love and, therefore, a "perfect law of liberty."[52]

From this point there is, indeed, only one more step to the recognition that the laws of history are moral laws exactly as the two main commandments to love God and one's neighbor. Even these basic laws of the Gospel are frequently disobeyed and, in the case of the second, even in the relations between individuals. They seem to be without direct connection with the problems which the historian has to study, particularly as far as the first law is concerned. Yet for the Christian they are the foundation of all laws, including those of history, and if the Catholic, and in general the Christian, historian wants to be consistent in his convictions, it is from the question as to whether or not that two-fold law of love has been obeyed or not

[50] In the volume entitled *Pio XII Pont. Max. Postridie Kalendas Martias MDCCCLXXVI-MDCCCLVI* (Roma, 1956) offered to His Holiness on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, W. d'Ormesson has made the most recent contribution to the study of the problem in "Le pape et la paix," (pp. 225-237), while Pius XII's encyclicals are discussed by E. Bergh (pp. 81-98) and his doctrine in matters of law by F. Carnelutti (pp. 115-133).

[51] *A Study of History*, IX, 338.

[52] *Ibid.*, IX, 395-405.

that he has to start his interpretation of both individual facts and the general process of history.

More modest than the Marxists, the Christian will not consider this any sensational discovery. On the contrary, it is a comfort to think, when facing that great responsibility, that some of the noblest minds of all ages and all countries of Christian tradition have not hesitated to proclaim this simple truth and have tried to apply such an interpretation of history to the solution of historical problems. Here in the United States, and in the centennial year of Woodrow Wilson's birth, it is appropriate to recall as such an example one of the basic principles which this distinguished historian, at the same time a highly original political philosopher and constructive peacemaker, enunciated at a time of crisis not unlike our own. Less known than Wilson's specific fourteen points, the following statement included in the so-called "four ends" of his speech of July 4, 1918, might be opposed to all views which consider it unrealistic, if not naive, to believe that the same moral laws which any Christian considers the basis of decent relations between private individuals, should and could be followed in the relations between all communities, in those social relations which are the core and essence of history. This is the "end" which the president listed third but which, as a matter of fact, is the center of his whole conception, independent of any contingencies of the given moment: "The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct towards each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern states in their relations with one another."[53]

Wilson was wise enough to call this an "end," but not fortunate enough to achieve that end in carrying out his peace program. But he made an outstanding contribution both theoretical and practical in that direction and so have other men, very different in many respects from that scholar-statesman of recent days, under entirely different circumstances. And since dangerous trends in the opposite direction appearing today in a historiography which formally seems to be Polish, although it is a product of foreign pressure, political and intellectual, have been used as warning examples at the beginning of this discussion, it is only fair to cite other examples of profound

[53] Reprinted from the *Congressional Record*, LVI, 8671, in C. E. Black and E.C. Helmreich, *Twentieth Century Europe* (New York, 1950), p. 841.

respect for the moral laws of history from the genuine Polish tradition.

The first of these examples will take us back more than 500 years to the origin of that Polish-Lithuanian Union which, according to the most qualified historians of various lands beginning with Ranke,[54] was the decisive turning point in the destinies of all Eastern Europe. While agreeing as to the outstanding importance of the great event, these historians completely differ in its interpretation and evaluation. Even in Polish historiography there have always been two schools of thought in that complex matter, while today the Marxist school is particularly hostile to that element of the national tradition. There is only one way of approaching it correctly and this was done by the contemporaries, by both writers and statesmen of the first generation which experienced the consequences of the vital decision of 1385. In the preamble of the particularly significant union charter of 1413,[55] the *mysterium caritatis* was praised in inspiring words as the only sound basis of human relations in the whole field of politics. And two years later, when the Council of Constance made a final attempt to revive mediaeval universalism, the Polish scholar, Paulus Vladimiri, one of the first rectors of the University of Cracow, who defended the Jagellonian Union against aggressive imperialism, did it in a treatise which was, indeed, a whole philosophy of history based upon the validity of moral laws in international relations, including the propagation of the Catholic faith by methods of love.[56] Those who in the University of Cracow, as well as in constitutional charters and international assemblies, proclaimed such principles as fundamentals of the historical process were themselves inspired by the recent memory of the saintly Queen Jadwiga[57] who through her personal sacrifice had made the Polish-Lithuanian Union possible. It was Queen

[54] The appraisals of Ranke and a few others are quoted by Gotthold Rhode, *Die Ostgrenze Polens* (Köln, 1955), I, 295, n. 2.

[55] Stanislaw Kutrzeba and Wladyslaw Semkowicz (Eds.), *Akta Unii Polski z Litwa* (Cracow, 1932), p. 53.

[56] Some of the ideas of Paulus Vladimiri have recently been treated by François Kapelinski in *Revue internationale d'histoire politique et constitutionelle*, (1956), 201-214, and a full bibliography is given by St. Belch who edited one of his treatises in *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium* (Roma, 1955), II, 165, n. 2 and 166, n. 3.

[57] The best scholarly biography of the queen is by Wanda Maciejewska, *Jadwiga Krolowa Polska* (Cracow, 1934).

Jadwiga who on the eve of her death prepared the reorganization of the university which was to spread the Catholic faith and western civilization among the Lithuanians and Ruthenians. It is only in the light of these ideas that the whole development of the Jagellonian state system, so important for the history of all East Central Europe, can be properly understood and judgments expressed regarding both the concrete achievements and the practically unavoidable shortcomings of those who in the subsequent centuries had the responsible task of implementing these ideas.

One of the most momentous implementations was to be the religious union with the Ruthenian Church concluded at the Synod of Brest in 1596. In that matter there is again a striking discrepancy between the interpretations by historians of different schools and backgrounds. Neither a narrow nationalistic point of view, nor a reduction of a specifically religious problem to a socio-economic antagonism between feudal landlords and the common people, can do justice to that reunion and to its lasting consequences. To evidence the real issue, it will suffice to quote from the last appeal which Sigismund III, the King of Poland frequently accused of Catholic "fanaticism," addressed, not to the helpless people, but to the most "feudal" magnate who opposed the union. He declared that just as he would never use violence forcing him to accept the union with Rome, so he would not permit him to use violence against those who spontaneously wanted to join that union.[58]

Even more eloquent and timely is another example recalled this year by a 300th anniversary which was celebrated even in Communist controlled Poland, and which is connected with one of the issues which Marxist historiography considers typical of the whole period of "feudalism." At Easter of 1656, King John Casimir, impressed by the miraculous defense of the Monastery of Czestochowa a few months before, made in the city of Lwow a twofold vow: choosing the Mother of God as Patroness and Queen of Poland, he promised to perpetuate her veneration in his country; and deploring "the tears and oppression of the peasants," he also promised, on the restoration of peace, to strive "in consort with all the Estates . . . that the people of my kingdom shall be freed from all unjust burdens and oppres-

[58] This recently discovered document will be published in the forthcoming volume of *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium*.

sion."[59] While the first of these pledges was faithfully kept by the king, and has been retained by the whole nation to the present day as a permanent source of comfort, nothing was done for more than a century to fulfill the second. And though serfdom was not at all peculiar to Poland, it was a special disgrace in a country otherwise so proud of its civic freedom and in the end contributed to its decline. But blaming the serfdom of the peasants in the name of a materialistic doctrine which considers the struggle of the classes as something natural and economic motives as a determining factor is an incongruity in Poland or anywhere else; it has to be done in the name of moral laws, in the spirit of the vow of 1656.

The belief in moral laws which gives a real sense to all events of history, a profound meaning to the sufferings of both individuals and nations, and an inspiring purpose to those who are history's makers and writers, was typical of Poland's political philosophy throughout the ordeal of foreign rule in the partitioned country. In that connection it is instructive to return to the case of Adam Czartoryski which served before as an example of Marxist criticism directed against "bourgeois" historiography. If Czartoryski's recent biographers are blamed for the very choice of their topic, it is not only because of their "hero-worship" for a prince and a conservative statesman, but even more because that man, who turned from cooperation with Russia to desperate struggle against her, also turned from Freemasonry to devout Catholicism, and in both these otherwise very different phases of his long diplomatic activity as a Polish patriot he defended in theory and practice the respect of high principles and moral laws. He summarized his interpretation of history in the brief sentence: "Catholicism should not come from the love of one's country, but patriotism from the love of God."[60] In that respect the aristocrat of royal blood was in full agreement with the democratic poet and publicist, Adam Mickiewicz, his companion in exile, whom Marxist propaganda would like to make a precursor of Communism. On the recent celebration of the centenary of Mickiewicz's death in 1855, however, it was convincingly demonstrated that the great spir-

[59] Cf. the English translation of that vow in the study of M. Helm-Pirgo *Virgin Mary Queen of Poland* (New York, 1957).

[60] These words were written in Czartoryski's own hand on a frequently reproduced picture of the prince. Cf. the discussion of his political philosophy and his general characteristics in Kukiel, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-158; 314-322.

itual leader of the Polish emigration always remained faithful to his Catholic principles and to a spiritual and moral interpretation of history.[61]

This interpretation was, indeed, part of the so-called Polish messianism which led Mickiewicz, as well as others, to obvious deviations but not at all in the direction of any deterministic materialism; on the contrary, it was in the direction of an irrational mysticism. Any serious study of the philosophy of history of that messianism[62] leads, however, to the conclusion that it was or at least tried hard to be genuinely Christian, a desperate quest for the discovery and application of the moral laws common to private and social, national and international life. The approaching centenary of the death of another great Polish poet, Zygmunt Krasinski, who even more than Mickiewicz was at the same time a great philosopher of history, will be an excellent opportunity to re-examine the validity of his ideas. They have been surprisingly confirmed by the experience of the Communist revolution which, as a young man of twenty, he foresaw well before Marx's *Communist Manifesto*.[63] The "poet of thought" as Krasinski has been called, is, indeed, inseparable from his close friend, August Cieszkowski,[64] the "philosopher of action," who tried to interpret history through a commentary of the Lord's Prayer, which, if not always strictly orthodox, was, however, entirely based upon the belief in not only the existence but the certain triumph of the moral laws preached by Christ.

Cieszkowski was wrong when in his chiliastic vision he saw that certain triumph in the establishment of the Kingdom of God here on earth, in the third and final phase of human history, in the age of the Holy Spirit coming after those of the Father and the Son. And though he was also himself a professional historian, his ideas, which seemed inspiring even to foreign scholars and made them

[61] Cf. the studies by Jrena Galezowska and Maria Czapska in *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium*, II, 15-128.

[62] Cf. Edmund Zawacki, "Mass Messianism, Mickiewicz versus Marx," in *Mickiewicz and the World* (Buffalo, 1955).

[63] In his *Un-Divine Comedy*, published in 1835, and brought out in English translations at Philadelphia in 1875 and in London in 1924, the latter having a preface by G.K. Chesterton.

[64] On both of these writers cf. Roman Dyboski, *Poland in World Civilization* (New York, 1950), pp. 94, 215.

interested in the Polish tradition,[65] were never fully accepted by Polish historiography, not even by those of its leading representatives who like Josef Szujski in Cieszkowski's lifetime, or Bronislaw Dembinski in the last pre-war generation, shared his conviction that in history's process under God what really matters is the question whether these moral laws are obeyed or not. But for Catholic historiography of all countries it is high time to oppose to the Marxist philosophy of history and to its application based upon the certainty of Communist victory—to a wrong idea leading to infinite wrong in the practice of life—a truly Christian philosophy of history and its application based upon the hope of a possible victory of a right idea to the benefit of mankind. And never before was it as urgent to replace the passive surrender to allegedly objective laws, as inescapable as those of nature, by the active respect of moral laws, as natural as the former, but entirely different from them, objective, to be sure, but dependent in their efficiency on the free will of the subject to whom God has given them.

In our atomic age it has become almost a commonplace to stress the responsibilities of the natural scientist. They are great, surely, but even greater are those of the social scientist and particularly of the historian. The most revolutionary discoveries in the field of nuclear physics are nothing but the normal consequences of the progress of science, discoveries of unescapable laws of nature which in themselves are neither good nor bad. All depends on the application of such discoveries, and that again depends on the observance of moral laws which need not to be discovered, since God Himself has revealed them to man, but have to be acknowledged, observed, and followed. This is particularly difficult in the field of those social, economic, and political, relations—both national and international—which we call history, whenever we consider them, as we ought to, not merely in their static condition of a given moment, but in their dynamic evolution from man's origin to his ultimate goal. And this is precisely the task of the historian.

He has to face that task and its consequences especially in a time of transition and crisis like our own. His scholarly experience can be a helpful contribution to the solution of such a crisis were it only

[65] This is the case with W.J. Rose who translated into English parts of Cieszkowski's masterpiece; cf. also his *Poland Old and New* (London, 1948), pp. 213, 218 ff.

through the instructive analogies which history suggests. But history never repeats itself completely, and even the most striking analogies can prove superficial and even misleading as, e.g., that so frequently made, between the present crisis and the end of the ancient, Graeco-Roman world. For those who do not believe in "objective" or rather fatal laws of history, but in moral laws, sometimes accepted and sometimes, or rather more frequently, rejected, it is much more instructive to make on the eve of an approaching turn of human destinies some kind of an examination of conscience, as our remote ancestors, inspired by their still young and recent Christian faith, used to do when they expected and feared such a decisive turn.

This was the case when toward the end of the first Christian millennium the approaching year 1000 created such a state of mind, well described by contemporary chroniclers and in retrospective studies of historians of our own time.[66] That state of mind was created not only by almost apocalyptic visions of an obscure, chiliastic mysticism, full of superstition, but also by the awareness that a long and rather dark period of history was coming to its end, a period in which the moral laws proclaimed at its beginning had been more and more widely accepted but, nevertheless, rarely obeyed. And the troublesome question was whether in the forthcoming period, if there was to be at all a continuation of that historical process, a closer observance of these laws would improve the conditions of civilized society.

That civilized society was then far from being world wide. But in the preceding century Europe, at least, had been made and constituted as a community which around 1000 seemed well established and completed: under a great pope and a promising young emperor of truly universal outlook closely co-operating with each other; with a *Sclavinia* or Slavic world added to the Latin, Celtic, and Germanic; with Europe's West and East not yet separated by any final schism.[67] All this will soon be recalled in the celebrations of impressive millenaries of which that of the restoration of the Western Roman Empire will have the widest appeal in view of the contemporary ef-

[66] Henri Focillon, *L'an mil* (Paris, 1952); cf. also the earlier studies cited there, p. 43, n. 1.

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 107-152, and the frequently reproduced contemporary picture on page 131.

forts toward European integration, while that of Catholic Poland will best evidence the contrast between her genuine tradition and its present distortion. Since the case of that largest country in East Central Europe is once more typical of the fate of the whole region, the publication of the monumental series *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium*,[68] started in Rome two years ago and to be continued until the anniversary year of 1966, will have a symbolic significance with repercussions in other countries of similar experiences. The millenary of the conversion of Kievan Rus to the faith of a still Catholic Eastern Christendom will particularly appeal to those Ukrainians of today who, in spite of all persecutions, remained faithful to the tradition of religious union with Rome. And the millenary of Hungary's apostolic crown will almost coincide with that of the spectacular events of the very year 1000 which confirmed Poland's independence, made a Czech martyr a patron of both West Slavic nations and of European unity, and glorified the difficult beginnings of the conversion of the Baltic peoples.[69]

More than ever a living past, living after 1000 years, will make us feel the continuity of European history throughout the second millennial period of the Christian era, a period which was to be the European age of world history. The nations of Europe owed that privilege and, in general, their ten centuries of greatness, not to any predetermined laws which made them pass from tenth-century feudalism to twentieth-century capitalism, nor, indeed, to any special merits of their own, least of all to their colonial expansion, but to the fact that through most of that time they were practically identical with Christendom, that their *Respublica Christiana*, though never fully organized, was based, at least at the time of its greatest extent, on the recognition of the moral laws of history, and that their expansion, though shockingly imperialistic, made possible the expansion of Christianity all over the world.[70]

To study that heritage, and the causes of why today 1000 years after the final making of Europe, we are witnessing what might be

[68] Cf. the introduction to Volume I (Roma, 1954) by the chairman of the editorial committee, Archbishop Joseph Gawlina, pp. 7-8.

[69] Francis Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (London, 1949), especially Chapters III-IV.

[70] O. Halecki, "The Place of Christendom in the History of Mankind," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, I (1954), 926-950.

called the unmaking of Europe, or at least facing such a danger—this is the most urgent duty of the European historian. It is a duty of universal significance because it cannot be conceived without the realization that a great community's rise and decline depended on its attitude toward moral laws, on the degree of respect for them inside that community and in its relations with the outside world. Even problems of a basically economic character and, therefore, put forward by the Marxists as argument in favor of their interpretation, cannot be correctly understood without considering their moral repercussions on the development of society. To the example of the problem of serfdom that of the so-called Industrial Revolution can be added with good reason. And whatever might be said about the intimate connection of religious and social problems, evidenced by a number of examples taken from Central and Eastern European history,[71] the last 1000 years exemplify at the same time the moral character of both categories of problems, as well as of their connection, since the whole issue can be reduced to the typically European question of the relation between the two great ideals of faith and freedom.[72]

Calling it typically European is hardly any self-centeredness, nor is the profound, scholarly, and moral interest in the meaning of Europe's millennium similar to the chiliastic conceptions which, as recently described, Russia, both Muscovite and Bolshevik, has in common with the Asiatic East.[73] These conceptions, too, are inspired by deep moral concerns, since the moral laws of history are truly universal. But in their logical consequences with reference to the present crisis these conceptions, especially in their distortion by a Russianized Marxism which remains, of course, optimistic as far as the victory of socialism is concerned, are deeply pessimistic regarding the survival of the historical past and its heritage. Contrary to the historically minded Polish messianism which expected a new and happier period of history, the Eurasian, as the Russian and the Eastern taken together might be called, is inclined to think that the end of all history has now arrived.

[71] Günther Stökl, "Religiös-soziale Bewegungen in der Geschichte Ost-und Südosteuropas," *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft*, II (1955), 257-275.

[72] Barbara Ward, *Faith and Freedom* (New York, 1954), pp. 69-86, 263.

[73] Emmanuel Sarkisyanz, *Russland und der Messianismus des Ostens* (Tübingen, 1955); cf. on "the end of history," p. 147.

This is certainly not the American approach to history which, contrary to the frequently but misleadingly stressed analogies between the two "young" peoples of the United States and Soviet Russia, is optimistic not only as to social and economic progress, of course, in a truly democratic non-Marxist sense, but also as to the lasting value of the heritage of the past. But this leads to a final question which must be asked in conclusion of a discussion of the laws of history from a European point of view, a discussion that has always taken its illustrations from European history, and very frequently from the history and historiography of a country situated in the distant, little known eastern part of the continent, far from the Atlantic shores.

In an essay which, brief as it is, will remain a classic of American thought, Carlton J. H. Hayes has given a truly illuminating answer to the question: "The American Frontier—Frontier of What?"[74] He has convincingly shown that the American frontier in the traditional sense, viz., that frontier of the United States which deserves special attention and solicitude, being at the same time an inspiration and a challenge, is now deep in the heartland of the European continent since it is "a frontier of European culture." For the new Atlantic community of which the United States is the undisputed leader, includes all of Europe that wants to be faithful to its heritage and, therefore, even countries as far away as Poland, since that community is, as was the European of the millennium now coming to a close, primarily a spiritual community.

It will not, then, perhaps, appear too presumptuous to ask the question: "The American heritage—heritage of what?" It is certainly, first of all, the historical heritage of the United States since the day of the Declaration of Independence and, therefore, different from the European as far as the subsequent period of transition, in particular the nineteenth century is concerned, the transition from the War for Independence to World War I in which the United States participated, thus entering the field of world affairs. European history of that period, although highly interesting for all Americans, is obviously not *their* history except for recent immigrants. But, on the contrary, for all Americans, including the first immigrants of the colonial period, and the sons and daughters of the

[74] *American Historical Review*, LI (January, 1946), 199-216.

American Revolution, the history of Europe before the arrival of their ancestors in the Western Hemisphere *is* their history, being that of their earlier ancestors from whatever country they came at a time when Europe was definitely one. And this is by far the longest, although not the nearest part of European history. Hence the growing American interest in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

This means that the largest, even if it be not the most modern, part of the European heritage is likewise part of the American heritage, its older but, therefore, basic part. It is also because it includes the whole Christian and humanist tradition of a time when western Christianity was still undivided and humanism was not yet secularized. For that very reason the millenary of Europe and the task of interpretating its history as a whole in the light of universal history's moral laws cannot be a matter of indifference to American historians. On the spiritual front, the most important of all, and on its historiographical sector, one of the most important although, of course, second to the religious, the American historians are fighting one and the same battle with their colleagues from all the European lands, as far as the latter are free to fight. They must believe with these European colleagues in the possibility of victory over a basically wrong interpretation of history, a victory which will be a valuable contribution to the triumph of faith and freedom in general. In the field of history it will be the triumph of the interpretation of the historical process in the light of our Christian faith and of the truth, for us self-evident, that in the whole course of that process man was and will remain free from any despotic laws of nature, free to follow out of profound conviction, for his own and for the world's salvation, the moral laws of God.

Fordham University

THE GERMAN CENTER PARTY DURING WORLD WAR I. AN INTERNAL STUDY

By

John K. Zeender*

With the waning of the *Kulturkampf* in the late 1870's internal conflicts within the Center Party had taken place with increasing frequency and intensity; but none of these bore comparison with the deep-seated struggles of the period of World War I. The Center had originally made up an essential part of a right-wing coalition which wanted a peace of annexations and the preservation of the political *status quo* at home. In 1916 these leaders finally won a protracted struggle with more democratic groups favoring a moderate foreign policy and internal reforms. Then Matthias Erzberger suddenly overthrew the conservative leadership in July, 1917, by the effect of his appeal for a peace of understanding, political reforms, and a coalition with the parties of the left. But the Erzberger movement ran into sand in the face of the Ludendorff dictatorship and the conservative leadership within Center ranks in 1918. The last year of the war produced little but hard fighting and caused some conservatives and democrats to consider the dissolution of their old party.

To date there is still no thorough study on a documentary basis of these internal developments which were so important for the determination of Reichstag policy in the war.[1] Karl Bachem, the party historian[2] and prominent figure in the Center's high councils, chose

* Mr. Zeender is associate professor of history in the University of Massachusets. He was enabled to do research for this article in Germany by reason of a Fulbright Grant.

[1] There are several doctoral dissertations which deal with the Center in this period: Hans Illich, *Über die Haltung der Zentrumspresse zur Parlamentarisierung 1917-18* (Würzburg, 1932); Paul W. Klinke, "Die deutsche Zentrumspartei und die demokratische Frage," (Hamburg, 1950); and Frieda Wacker, *Die Haltung der Deutschen Zentrumspartei zur Frage der Kriegsziele im Weltkrieg* (Würzburg, 1937). While all are useful, none is based upon internal party documents.

[2] *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte, und Politik der Deutschen Zentrumspartei*, 9 vols. (Köln, 1927 ff). It should be stated that it was the Bachem Papers, now in the Köln Stadtarchiv, that made this study possible.

to treat this phase of the party's history with amazing superficiality. The fact that internal party materials were generally unavailable until a few years ago was undoubtedly a major barrier to scholarly research by others. The result is that Arthur Rosenberg's brilliant study, *Die Entstehung der deutschen Republik 1871-1918*, which provides a general survey of German political history in the period indicated, still offers the best insights into the Center's inner history.[3]

The Center's preference for a conservative course in the first three years of the war cannot be understood without some knowledge of the basic policy it had pursued since the mid-1890's. After the elections of 1890 it became clear to political observers that the so-called "national" parties, the Conservatives and National Liberals, would never again be able to form a stable majority without the Center. Windthorst had already begun to accustom the Catholic electorate to the new responsibility of working in harness with the government and its friends when he died in March, 1891. Long accustomed to the rejection of expensive army, navy, and colonial programs, the party's supporters were not willing to follow Windthorst's successors so readily. It was only in 1898 that Ernst Lieber, Windthorst's eventual successor, brought his party into line on these major national issues when the Center ensured the passage of the initial Tirpitz naval bill which was eventually to make Germany a naval as well as land power. However painful it was for a mass party to approve taxes for the modern accoutrements of national power and prestige, the Center gladly took chief credit for the passage of army, navy, and colonial budgets. A period of exclusion from the government majority between 1907 and 1909, caused by the government's resentment of criticism of its colonial policy from the Center left-wing, only strengthened the leaders' resolve to preserve their party's reputation of national reliability.[4]

[3] Berlin, 1918. All references in this study are to the English translation, *The Birth of the German Republic, 1871-1918* (New York, 1931). Rosenberg made good use of the testimony which Center deputies gave before the Reichstag Committee of Inquiry. Cf. Germany, Nationalversammlung, *Das Werk des Untersuchungsausschusses*, 4 Reihe, "Die Ursachen des Deutschen Zusammenbruchs im Jahre 1918," 12 vols. (Berlin, 1925-1929), cited hereafter as *U.A.* 4 Reihe.

[4] The writer has dealt with this whole development at some length in his doctoral dissertation, "The German Center Party and the Growth of German National Power, 1890-1906," (Yale, 1952).

The Center's alignment with the government and right-wing parties is not hard to explain. Bureaucrats, landowners, clergymen, and professional men supplied the political ideas and leadership of the Catholic community. Their natural conservative orientation found additional justification, so they thought, in the rapidly growing popularity of the Social Democratic Party in Germany. Like the German bishops, they believed that the Catholic minority and the Church would suffer if the semi-absolute monarchy ever gave way to a democratic state of either the French or British muster.[5] They were especially concerned over the future of the confessional school in Prussia, a state with a sizeable Catholic minority; a pessimistic view which was later proven to be unwarranted. Unwilling, therefore, to work with the left-wing parties for the democratization of the German state, the Center could only achieve its goals by seeking the favor of the monarchy and its older parliamentary allies.

It would be unfair, however, to explain this basic policy in terms of nothing more than a political *quid pro quo* relationship. The party leaders, born in the 1840's and 1850's, had come to manhood during or just after the drive for German national unity and had experienced the strain of the *Kulturkampf*. They felt a deep psychological need to prove the patriotism of German Catholics. This attitude was all of a piece with Carl Muth's efforts in *Hochland* to bring Catholics to an appreciation of German secular culture, the attempts of scholars like Georg von Hertling, Herman Finke, and Hermann Grauert, to win recognition for Catholic scholarship from Protestant academicians, and the desire of Adam Stegerwald, aided by Center leaders, to form an interdenominational trade union movement on a Christian basis.

To a great extent these basic considerations also explain the Center's exaggerated reluctance to criticize official foreign policy. Nowhere were emperor and chancellor more sensitive to their powers than in the sphere of foreign relations. Windthorst himself had rarely touched this nerve after 1879, the year which witnessed the end of the *Kulturkampf* and the formation of the alliance with Catholic Austria. His successors followed his cue and gave the same recognition to a Bülow which Windthorst had with greater right given to

[5] *U. A.*, 4 Reihe, VII², 227 ff.

Bismarck.[6] Center speeches on foreign affairs followed closely the line drawn by the government speaker,[7] and were obviously intended —at least after 1904—to shore up the reputation of German diplomacy which had lost prestige after the formation of the Entente Cordiale.

While the Center's "national" policies led to the gradual liberation of the Church and to the admission of more Catholics to the Prussian and imperial civil services, they also carried a heavy mortgage. They committed the Center to the preservation of the undemocratic three-class voting system in Prussia which gave the Conservative Party a swollen representation in the Prussian House of Deputies. Election speeches to the contrary, Center leaders in Prussia were not interested in replacing the archaic electoral system with a more democratic form.[8] But assured of their power, the Prussian and German Conservatives would not repay the Center by approving the repeal of the remaining disabilities against the Society of Jesus.[9]. Nor would they make any sincere effort to abandon their virtual monopoly of the choice positions in the Prussian administrative system. A zealous defender of the Conservative alliance, Karl Bachem, admitted that this relationship was at best an unhappy marriage of convenience for most Catholics in the Rhineland.[10]

The unpopularity of the party's conservative course was gradually expressed in a loss of support among urban Catholic workers. The Socialist victory at the polls in 1912, which saw the Social Democrats replace the Center as the strongest party in the Reichstag, was

[6] Lieber never tired of repeating the dictum that German parties had to be "black, white, and red," where foreign affairs were concerned; and that the Center should extend itself to avoid criticism of the government in this area. *Reichstag Debates,* February 22, 1897; Martin Spahn, *Ernst Lieber* (Gotha, 1906), p. 58.

[7] Zeender, *op cit.,* p. 213.

[8] Karl Bachem claimed that Windthorst's plea for equal suffrage in Prussia had a purely tactical origin and had become a millstone to the party. Bachem to Felix Porsch, April 18, 1917. Bachem Papers, Köln Stadtarchiv.

[9] That part of the Jesuit Law of 1872 which prohibited the establishment of Jesuit foundations in Germany was to remain intact until 1917. Another article empowering individual states to expel Jesuits without notice had been repealed after heavy and prolonged Center pressure in 1904.

[10] Bachem to Franz Bühl, Member of Bavarian State Council, August 25, 1917. Bachem Papers.

undoubtedly due in some measure to Catholic votes.[11] Not that the Center was lax in its concern for social reform, for Max Weber's famous witticism that a wealthy industrialist like August Thyssen had at least the status of "an archbishop in the Center party"[12] is misleading. It is unlikely that any party in the Western Hemisphere compiled any better record before 1914.[13] Center leaders had founded the Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland and gave it direction and support in its strenuous campaign to win episcopal and papal approval of the new Christian interdenominational trade union movement. But the Reichstag and Prussian Center delegations contained only a few labor members and the rural areas were more strongly represented than their Catholic populations warranted.[14] In hard competition with the Social Democratic trade unions, Catholic labor leaders could well ask how long they could accept plutocratic suffrage in Prussia, indirect taxation, and other conservative policies.

The awareness of these problems intensified in 1912 an already existing crisis in leadership in the party. Temporarily resolved in 1908 by the election of Baron Georg von Hertling, a longtime member of the party, a noted scholar, and a skillful conciliator, the problem took on new acuteness when he resigned in February, 1912, to become Minister-President of Bavaria. The new parliamentary leader, Peter Spahn, though of Rhenish origin, had an essentially sympathetic view of Prussian institutions because of his long service in the Prussian judiciary, most of it spent "beyond the Elbe." Like his more outspoken historian son, Martin, the elder Spahn was also drawn to the right by a desire to bring conservative Catholicism and con-

[11] In 1881, 63.8% of the Catholic vote had been cast for the Center Party; in 1912 only 54.5%. The loss chiefly benefited the left-wing parties. Cf. Dr. Johannes Schauff, *Die Deutschen Katholiken und Die Zentrumspartei* (Koln, 1928), pp. 75 ff. Felix Cardinal von Hartmann, Archbishop of Cologne, estimated in 1912 that approximately 800,000 Catholics belonged to Social Democratic trade unions. Emil Ritter, *Die Katholisch-Sociale Bewegung Deutschlands im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert und der Volksverein* (Köln, 1954), p. 333.

[12] Max Weber, *Gesammelte politischen Schriften* (München, 1921), p. 126.

[13] The Center's record in the decade before the war is generously evaluated in Clemens von Delbrück, *Die Wirtschaftliche Mobilmachung in Deutschland 1914* (München, 1914), pp. 25-32.

[14] The moderate trade union editor and Center deputy, Joseph Joos, later complained that the pre-war leadership had been overly inclined to impose its own policies on the rank-and-file. *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, September 15, 1919; hereafter cited as *KV*.

servative Protestantism closer together.[15] Spahn refused to sponsor policies which would weaken the existing monarchical, aristocratic, and federal institutions, although he was by no means a static conservative. Yet he could not formulate any policy which would reconcile the social and political aspirations of the masses with the existing constitutions of the German and Prussian states.[16]

Both political and personality differences separated Spahn from the leading democrat of the party, the youthful Matthias Erzberger. The younger man, accustomed to the more democratic institutions of southern Germany, openly stated that the universal tide of democracy would sweep away the resistance of the monarchies and aristocracy.[17] Erzberger's leadership of the party's left-wing in the attack upon the colonial administration in 1906, which had cost the Center its prized place in the government coalition for two years, only temporarily reduced his influence in the Center. His inexhaustible energy, his mastery of budget problems, and his political flair soon made him an active factor in policy decisions. But Erzberger was too realistic to believe that his party and the nation were yet ready for democratic government. His immediate aim was, therefore, the formation of a coalition with the liberal parties to achieve liberal political and constitutional reforms.[18]

For a short time in 1912-1913 it appeared as if Erzberger would be able to turn the party into such a course. Some influential moderate conservatives, closer in age and basic political beliefs to Spahn, agreed that Erzberger's proposed tactic was suited to the existing political situation. The directing spirit of this group was Julius Bachem, political editor of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* probably the most gifted of Windthorst's pupils.[19] Both Bachem and his political disciple, Karl Trimborn, had intimate ties with the Volksverein and

[15] Carl Peter Spahn, son of Martin Spahn, to the writer, Bonn, January 3, 1955.

[16] In discussing the political situation with his son, Martin, just before the war, he said, "Everything is as brittle as if it were made of glass. Things can only be arranged with the greatest care according to each individual case." Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

[17] Matthias Erzberger, *Politik und Völkerleben* (Paderborn, 1913), p. 23.

[18] *Der Tag,* December 12, 1908.

[19] On Windhorst and Bachem cf. Carl Bachem to Herr Ass, July 2, 1932. Bachem Papers. Also Martin Spahn, "Julius Bachem," in *Hochland* (April, 1918), p. 20.

the Christian trade unions; he urged, therefore, that the Center should abandon its traditional opposition as a federalist party to direct national taxes and associate with the liberals in a program of tax reform.[20]

After an auspicious beginning,[21] the new course was suddenly arrested. Even Erzberger had to move to the right in the summer of 1913 and to admit that political necessity would not permit the isolation of the German Conservatives.[22] Undoubtedly the growth of national tensions in Europe, with the attendant emphasis in Germany upon "national" policies, influenced the Center's resolution. But the assumption would seem to be warranted that the national membership of the Center Party did not approve of the Reichstag's new orientation. The new national committee, established in February, 1914, to resolve the crisis in leadership, elected Peter Spahn and Felix Porsch, staunch conservatives, as national and deputy national chairmen of the party. Erzberger's name was significantly missing from the new national council.[23]

The outbreak of the war soon provided the conservative leaders with an issue capable of uniting the dissident groups within the party: the issue of war aims. The Center's position on this question followed naturally from the course it had taken since the late 1890's. A party which had uncritically accepted its government's explanation that Germany's growing isolation after 1904 was due to foreign envy of her success and influence[24] would hardly be able to think constructively about a practicable peace after August, 1914. The question of war aims not only gave the Center leaders an opportunity to demonstrate the patriotism of German Catholics, but it also provided a means of profiting politically from the nationalist resurgence at the expense of the Socialists who represented a policy of victory without annexations. Possessing only a few members with cosmopolitan backgrounds or broad foreign experience, the Center

[20] Martin Spahn, *Deutsche Lebensfragen* (München, 1914), pp. 77-79, 92-93.

[21] The Center broke a four-year tie with the Conservatives to concert with the Liberals on a property tax and on the parliamentary right to appellation. Peter Spahn was indignant over the tax agreement. *U.A.* 4 Reihe, VII², p. 236.

[22] *Der Tag*, August 15, 1913.

[23] *Kölnische Lokal-Anzeiger*, February 9, 1914.

[24] Zeender, *op. cit.*, pp. 234, 245.

as a party was not able to view the war aims problem with any detachment or clear vision.[25]

The net result of the Center's adoption of a victorious peace policy was to force Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg in a similar direction. A moderate in any case, the chancellor wanted to preserve the unity of the home front by not alienating the Socialists. But as Graf von Westarp, the Conservative leader later sardonically and happily recalled, Spahn and Adolph Gröber felt that they had to take the lead in approaching and prodding the reluctant Bethmann-Hollweg.[26] The Center leaders had satisfied themselves with general statements about the necessity of annexations in 1914 and 1915. In April, 1916, however, Spahn went beyond the chancellor's general promise to win security for Germany in the West by saying that Belgium "will fall into our hands politically, militarily, and economically."[27] In July of the same year the party head committed the Center to the annexation of additional Polish territory to Prussia, although the Center generally favored the creation of an autonomous Poland under Austrian suzerainity.[28]

The conservative leaders could confidently associate the whole Center organization with such a program because both the southern democratic and the western trade union movement were generally in agreement with it. The statement of the Baden Centrist Belzer to his countryman, the Progressive deputy Conrad Haussmann, in May, 1915, that his party was split over the question of war aims, in particular over the disposition of Belgium,[29] was certainly an inflation of the views of a few persons rather than a representation of the position of even a determined minority.[29] The two leading deputies from the democratic south, where the later peace movement was to have its strongest roots, Adolph Gröber and Erzberger, were both

[25] One of the few who did view this question with balance and perspective, Prince Alois zu Löwenstein, wrote his wife that the pharisaism expressed in an annexationist article in the *KV* was due to "the complete inability of the average person to understand the thinking of other peoples to whom, since they speak a different language, he denies any humanity." Löwenstein Papers, Family Archive, Wertheim.

[26] Graf Kuno von Westarp, *Konservative Politik im letzen Jahrzehnt des Kaiserreiches* (Berlin, 1936), II, 128.

[27] Hans Gatzke, *Germany's Drive to the West* (Baltimore, 1950), p. 103.

[28] *Centrums-Parlaments-Correspondenz*, July 18, 1916.

[29] Conrad Haussmann, *Schlaglichter*, (Frankfurt a. M., 1924), p. 35.

ardent annexationists; in fact, Erzberger, associated with the Thyssen industrial interests and close to right-wing political leaders, initially took the position that Germany should seek all that the military situation would permit. Later in 1915 he gained a somewhat truer perspective and his position became roughly the equivalent of the party leadership.[30] Even the trade unions marched in line behind the party heads, although they showed no marked interest in the question before 1916.[31]

Of immeasurable importance was the change which had taken place in the policies of the leading Center newspaper, the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*. By far the most influential Catholic newspaper in Germany, it had carefully built up a reputation for enlightened reporting and refined political polemic. Its longtime political editor, Julius Bachem, had tried from the commencement of the war to strengthen Bethmann-Hollweg's position in Center circles,[32] and to win the support of the publisher, Franz X. Bachem, his second cousin, for a moderate program of annexations,[33] and to defend limited use of the submarine before the Catholic public.[34] But the publisher had early decided that his paper should follow the line of doing everything possible to stimulate the nation's will to win, a decision which isolated Julius Bachem in editorial conferences. It was ironical that the occasion for his abrupt dismissal was his opposition to the government's efforts to make Austria-Hungary purchase Italian neutrality by giving the Trentino to Italy.[35] This difference with the Foreign Office did not,

[30] Cf. Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, *Politische Dokumente*, 2 vols. (Hamburg, 1924-26), II, 69-72. Erzberger in the *KV*, March 30, 1915. In September, 1915, he spoke of controls over Belgium, acquisition of Longwy-Briey, Courland, and Lithuania, and of boundary rectifications in the East. Memorandum, September 15, 1915. Bachem Papers.

[31] The *Westdeutsche Arbeiterzeitung*, the weekly organ of the Catholic Workers' Associations, approved of sizeable annexations, but dealt only once with the subject in the year 1915. June 26, 1915. Hereafter cited as the *WAZ*.

[32] Julius Bachem in *Allgemeine Rundschau*, September 12, 1914. Letter or report of Hans Eisele, Berlin representative of the *KV*, September 24, 1914. Bachem Papers.

[33] Julius Bachem favored a moderate proposal of Prince Löwenstein's, but the editorial board chose the more ambitious suggestions of the publisher's brother, Karl Bachem. Franz X. Bachem to Karl Bachem, November 6, 1914. *Ibid.*

[34] Editorial memorandum, February 20, 1915. *Ibid.* *KV*, February 8, 10, 1915.

[35] Franz X. Bachem to Prälat Dr. Meyenberg, June 21, 1915. Bachem Papers.

it is true, disturb Bachem's relationships with the chancellor[36] but it removed the last restraint upon the new editors.

The departure of Julius Bachem from the *Kölnische Volkzeitung* brought his cousin Karl to the editor's chair, and gave a freer rein to the Berlin representative Hans Eisele. Bachem had distinguished himself as a redoubtable debater in the Reichstag, but had had also gained the reputation of being excessively legal-minded and inflexible.[37] This inflexibility expressed itself in his conviction that the preservation of unequal suffrage and the Conservative Party's position in Prussia must remain the keystone of Center policy.[38] The other face of this position was an irrevocable distrust and fear of Social Democracy. Eisele was even more zealous in his expression of conservative and anti-Socialist views; his favorite associates in Berlin were politicians of extreme conservative views, usually not members of the Center Party.[39] Both men regarded the war as an ideal opportunity to prove how much concern German Catholics had for the security and future of the German Reich. The worst criticism that they could make of Erzberger's peace program after July, 1917, was that it had largely nullified the effectiveness of their campaigns to achieve this goal. They also later assumed that it was largely due to the work of their paper that a Catholic, Count von Hertling, could become chancellor of Germany when the conflict had reached its climax late in 1917.[40]

Thus in the first sixteen months of the war the Center made possible a conservative and outspoken majority which identified Germany with a program of extensive annexations. In early 1916, however, the coalition threatened to fall apart because the Center's leaders now had to deal with insurgency in their own ranks. The cause of this struggle was the repeated and many sided attempts of annexationists and conservatives in the national Center organization to steer the Reichstag Catholic delegation into the sudden and violent right-wing campaign against Bethmann-Hollweg. The point of departure

[36] Bethmann wrote him a cordial note after his dismissal, April 10, 1915. Copy in Bachem Papers.

[37] *Kölnische Zeitung*, April 2, 1902.

[38] Bachem to Felix Porsch, April 18, 1917. Bachem Papers.

[39] As Karl Bachem later complained to his brother Franz Bachem in a letter of May 10, 1918. *Ibid.*

[40] Bachem to Eisele, April 16, 1918. *Ibid.*

for this campaign was, so his critics said, the chancellor's "weak" handling of the submarine question and his refusal to define a great war goal for Germany. Probably deeper was their dismay over his "new orientation" in home affairs. He had not only promised the Social Democrats that he would liberalize the German law of association as it affected unions; but he had also pledged the government, in January, 1916, to a reform of the Prussian suffrage, the sacred temple of all true conservatives. The goal of the chancellor's opponents was not, therefore, merely a modification of his policies but his replacement by a strong man of conservative and nationalistic antecedents.[41]

This campaign, insofar as the Center was concerned, derived much of its impetus from the Prussian and Bavarian branches of the party. The head of the Prussian Center Party, Felix Porsch, had long earlier decided to recognize the predominance of the landed and agrarian groups in his party.[42] Like his friend, Karl Bachem, he was convinced that the conservative alliance was the ABC of a policy aiming at the preservation of the confessional school.[43] Although the Prussian Center joined the right-wing parties in a joint resolution against the government's foreign policy on February 9, 1916, its real importance for the other political enemies of the chancellor lay in Porsch's ability to influence the leaders of the Reichstag delegation.[44]

The Bavarian Center, on the other hand, was to demonstrate even greater persistence in its oral and mining activity against Bethmann-Hollweg. The internal political motivation could not have been more apparent in the campaign of the party leaders. Bavarian opposition to army and navy expenditures had been a byword and headache

[41] Gatzke, *Germany's Drive to the West,* Chapters 2 and 3.

[42] Though at heart in agreement with the party leadership, Porsch had given up his Reichstag mandate when his aristocratic friends broke with the party over the army bill of 1893. Karl Bachem to Herr Ass, July 2, 1932. Bachem Papers.

[43] Porsch was to be one of the most determined opponents of Erzberger's later policy of a coalition with the left-wing parties, claiming that the democratic leader was ruining the Center. Porsch to Karl Bachem, August 25, 1917. *Ibid.*

[44] Porsch persuaded Spahn and Gröber to attend a meeting of the right-wing party leaders with the chancellor at which the Center representatives spoke their minds with considerable vigor. Report of Hans Eisele to the *KV*'s editorial board, February 15, 1916; *Ibid.*

to every leader since Windthorst;[45] although now the party acted as the zealous advocate of the navy. Hidden behind this concern for the most effective use of the navy's potential was a need to find a basis for co-operation with the annexationist National Liberal Party at the expense of the local Social Democrats.[46] But while the position of party leaders and prominent aristocrats like Count von Preysing and Baron von Franckenstein, sons of former Center dignitaries, reflected sharp opposition to Social Democracy, the peasant masses in Bavaria saw the submarine as the best means of ending oppressive wartime burdens. The existence of equal suffrage in Bavaria meant that the Bavarian Center reflected peasant opinion more accurately than did the Prussian Center.[47]

Of great concern to Bethmann-Hollweg was the fact that the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* used its influence to undermine his reputation and position. Erzberger had been able to keep the Bachems in hand throughout the greater part of 1915 by attributing to the chancellor greater war goals than those of the German Foreign Office. But the chancellor's treatment of the Socialists, to which Karl Bachem attributed the growth of defeatism and complaint about the war,[48] had obviously aggravated the editor's dislike for Bethmann. So Eisele was given a free hand. When the chancellor's aide tried to silence him with persuasion, he was told that the government would now have to admit that "the Center is national," and that Bethmann-Hollweg was an ineffective leader because he had made promises to the Social Democrats "on the suffrage, trade union, tax, and even on the war aims question."[49] Eisele's objective was clear enough. On February 16 his column carried the remarks "a many-shaped mass cannot fix a uniform war goal. Only a great and steady man can will it."[50] Then just a few days before the crown council

[45] Count Hertling was the only Bavarian of approximately thirty delegates who voted for the first Tirpitz naval bill of 1898. Georg von Hertling, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, 2 vols. (Kempten and München, 1919), II, 203.

[46] Eisele to the *KV*'s editorial board, October 3, 1916. Bachem Papers.

[47] Their spokesman in the party, Dr. Georg Heim, who knew little about foreign affairs and cared less, consistently stoked the fires of unlimited submarine warfare and a *Machtfriede* to the end of the war. Cf. *KV*, August 10, 1916; October 11, 1917.

[48] Bachem to Erzberger, December 23, 1915. *Ibid.*

[49] Report from Eisele to the *KV*'s editorial board, February 22, 1916. *Ibid.*

[50] *KV*, February 16, 1916.

was to decide on the question of unlimited submarine warfare, a duel between the chancellor and Tirpitz, he wrote "We stand in the submarine question completely on the side of the military authorities and the military authorities have the confidence of the nation."[51]

The defeat of Tirpitz in the crown council of March 4 ended the first round but not the major part of the campaign. In the second, the attempt to draw the Center into a solid right-wing front in the Reichstag against the chancellor, the government's forces were immeasurably strengthened by Erzberger's defensive activities. Slowly won over by Bethmann in 1915, Erzberger undoubtedly had a vested interest in Bethmann as chancellor because the latter had promised him a place at the peace conference.[52] But his numerous letters and reports to Karl Bachem, containing accounts of his talks with representatives of the Vatican and other neutral governments, suggest that he had learned both the truth of the war situation and a sense of responsibility.[53] Unlimited submarine warfare would be a gamble with the existence of the nation since Germany lacked enough submarines to drive England out of the war before the certain entrance of the United States.[54] Erzberger consistently represented this view, somewhat unsuccessfully with the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, but with definite results in an interview with the Minister-President of Bavaria, Count von Hertling,[55] and later with his own party.

The chancellor's position was further strengthened by the activity of the Volksverein and the Christian Trade Unions. The earlier docility that had characterized the attitude of the Volksverein and union representatives toward party leaders dissolved in 1915 under the strain of high prices and faulty provisioning. Whether lay or clerical, they had expressed their malaise in an evergrowing criticism of excessive agrarian influences in the party. The evidence of their independent thinking is to be found in their willingness to take the risks associated with the introduction of universal suffrage in Prus-

[51] *KV*, March 1, 1916.

[52] Karl Bachem, "Notes," May 2, 1918. Bachem Papers.

[53] By October, 1915, he was convinced that a politically important turn of the war in the West was out of the question. Memorandum, October 20, 1915. *Ibid.*

[54] Karl Bachem, "Notes," March 6, 1916. *Ibid.*

[55] Erzberger wrote Hertling on March 7, 1916, that his support of Bethmann-Hollweg had significantly influenced the emperor in his decision to back the chancellor against Tirpitz. Geheimes Staatsarchiv München. Hereafter cited as G. St. A. Mü.

sia; to say nothing of their demands for better representation of cities and taxation reforms.[56] After several meetings between representatives of all social and economic groups had led nowhere, Spahn called another assembly in early January, 1916, to secure unity on political and social issues. But like its predecessors the latest colloquy proved to be a complete failure. The labor representatives, who no longer accepted the thesis that the Social Democrats were unreliable, wanted the Center to combine with the Socialists on tax issues and to approve of suffrage reforms for Prussia. And the conservatives read the Volksverein and union representatives a lecture on the necessity of preserving the existing suffrage and the position of the Conservatives on behalf of the confessional school.[57]

Understandably the Volksverein and the unions looked upon Bethmann's fight as their own. Their representatives, undoubtedly advised by Julius Bachem, carried on a moderate polemic which kept the whole controversy on a high political and diplomatic level. They recalled that Bismarck had warned that only the chancellor had sufficient political and diplomatic information to foresee the consequences of military acts.[58] Bachem cleverly pointed out that Count Hertling, so esteemed by Catholic Germans, had supported the chancellor's foreign policy.[59] The *Westdeutsche Arbeiterzeitung* gave most of its front page in an April issue to letters from a soldier, one of which said in part: "I die gladly for Germany but not for one piece of foreign land."[60] Yet it was clear that Bethmann-Hollweg was important to them as a statesman promising internal reforms and not as a moderate war leader. When the Volksverein and union leaders privately expressed their resentment against their *bête noire*, Karl Bachem and his paper, they spoke of him as a "political and ecclesiastical reactionary,"[61] not as a "jingo" or ultra-nationalist.

The combined efforts of the Erzberger group and the trade union representatives and press were decisive elements in the refusal on March 15 of the Reichstag Center to join the Conservatives and the National Liberals in a common onslaught against the chancellor's

[56] Cf. Joseph Joos, *Materialen der Verbandszentrale der katholischen Arbeiter und Knappenzentrale* (München-Gladbach, October, 1915).
[57] Karl Bachem, "Notes," January 7, 1916. Bachem Papers.
[58] *WAZ*, March 11, 1916.
[59] *Der Tag*, March 22, 1916.
[60] *WAZ*, April 2, 1916.
[61] Eisele to Karl Bachem, April 29, 1916. Bachem Papers.

foreign and naval policies. Confronted with diverse statements from the naval authorities on Germany's ability to wage a successful unlimited submarine war, Spahn and Gröber dared not take the initiative against Bethmann-Hollweg in the Party.[62]

Undoubtedly the Center's action gave the chancellor a lease on life, or at least saved him from a humiliating shift in policy. The *Kölnische Volkszeitung* took the position that Bethmann was so firmly in the saddle that further attacks would only create bitterness and division in the party without accomplishing anything.[63] Only the Bavarian Centrists kept at work trying to use their King Ludwig III as a lever against the chancellor.[64] But the German statesman recognized how insecure he was. As long as the Center gave him no vote of confidence the Conservatives and the National Liberals would be a threat to him.[65] His own Centrist supporters, however, recognized that they could hardly think in those terms as long as the chancellor did not match his concessions to the Socialists by revocation of the old law against the Jesuits and by opening up the Prussian administrative service to more Catholics.[66] Here Bethmann's basic weakness of failing to take a strong stand where sound political judgment and equity required it proved to be his undoing. Before he could carry out his pledges on these issues it was too late.[67] Whether the Center would have supported him in the new test of strength if the reforms had taken place in the summer of 1916 is a moot point. The chancellor's pessimism was only too well founded. Falkenhayn's failure at Verdun, Austria's heavy defeats on the Russian front, and Rumania's sudden entrance into the war on the Allied side were all elements in the dissipation of the public's confidence in civilian leadership. Moreover, new military leaders, Hindenburg and Ludendorff, enjoyed an acclaim and confidence which threw the Emperor William II and his chancellor into the shadows. Bethmann himself tried to cover up his insecurity by iden-

[62] Report of Hans Eisele to the *KV*'s editors, March 16, 1916. *Ibid.*

[63] Draft of letter from Karl Bachem to Eisele, June 30, 1916. *Ibid.*

[64] Karl Bachem to Eisele, July 27, 1916. *Ibid. KV*, August 10, 1916.

[65] From a statement of Bethmann to Erzberger, Karl Bachem's "Notes," June 19, 1916.

[66] From remarks of Erzberger to Karl Bachem, *Ibid.*

[67] He told Erzberger that the Federal Council would act on the Jesuit law in the late fall. *Ibid.* The law was not revoked until the spring of 1917.

tifying the new commanders with his policy in the eyes of the nation.[68]

It was the Center Party which brought the whole question of civilian and military leadership to a sharp focus and assured the generals of the Reichstag's support. It is true that the leaders felt a special responsibility to maintain the unity of the Reichstag and the nation by taking a position which might satisfy all groups,[69] and at the same time legally harmonize the tremendous influences of the military chieftains with the letter of the constitution.[70] But Spahn and Gröber were glad to take this position in any case.[71] It seems clear, despite the lack of exact evidence, that the Center's national committee took the position that the party should stress the role of the military leaders in the determination of Germany's policy on the submarine issue.[72] The result was the famous Gröber resolution of October 16, 1916, presented to the Budget Committee as the Center's position on the submarine question:

> The Imperial Chancellor is solely responsible to the Reichstag for all his political decisions in connexion with the war. In taking his decisions the Imperial Chancellor must rely upon the views of the Supreme Command. If it is decided to initiate a ruthless submarine campaign, the Imperial Chancellor can be certain of the agreement of the Reichstag.[73]

The fact that Erzberger collaborated with Gröber on the formulation of this resolution which was intended to preserve the unity of party and Reichstag has led to the conclusion that Erzberger had turned his back on the civilian chancellor and had again moved into the military orbit.[74] This assumption merits respect because Erzberger was probably the person who accomplished the forced retire-

[68] Willy Bongard, *Die Zentrumsresolution vom 7 Oktober 1916* (Köln, 1937), p. 49. This work was a doctoral dissertation at the University of Cologne, and its author was a student of Martin Spahn's.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[70] Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

[71] Report of Eisele to the *KV* editorial board, October 10, 1916. Bachem Papers. His earlier reports of March 16 and 31, 1916, had already revealed how strongly the two men felt on the subject. *Ibid.*

[72] Eisele to Karl Bachem, October 21, 1921. *Ibid.*

[73] Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

ment of Foreign Secretary Gottfried von Jagow, a consistent foe of an extreme submarine policy. But it is evident that Prince Bernard von Bülow, Erzberger's candidate for the leadership of the German peace conference delegation, was the prime agent behind the resignation of Jagow.[75] Through sympathetic organs like the *Centrums-Parlaments-Correspondenz* and the *Germania*, Erzberger spread the interpretation that the resolution really meant that the Center would support the chancellor if he decided against unlimited submarine warfare.[76] He also made a vain attempt to win a vote of confidence for Bethmann in the party council.[77] In these efforts he was joined by representatives of the Volksverein and the Christian Trade Unions, who threatened a munitions strike and passive resistance if the chancellor were defeated on the submarine issue and forced to resign.[78] The fact that the chancellor capitulated and gave his approval to the introduction of unlimited submarine warfare freed the trade unionists in the Center from taking this advanced position.

For the next six months the conservative leadership was able to exercise a reasonably tight control over the party. Even the reverberations of the March revolution in Russia did not seriously menace their authority. Nor did Emperor William II's Easter decree of 1917 promising the replacement of the old Prussian suffrage by a universal, direct, but unequal form long disturb them. They soon saw that they could take the credit for supporting the shadow of reform without affecting the substance of power.[79] Against the bitter opposition of the labor groups, they decided that a plural vote would preserve the old order in Prussia.[80] It was probably the desire of the labor spokesmen to conciliate the conservatives, as well as the

[75] Erzberger said in September, 1916, that the whole storm against the government would blow over if Jagow was dropped. Count Hugo von Lerchenfeld, Bavarian Ambassador to Prussia, to Hertling, September 19, 1916. "Lerchenfeld-Hertling Correspondence," (typewritten manuscript), Dr. Ernst Deuerlein, editor. On Jagow's relations with Bülow, cf. Erzberger to Hertling, January 8, 1917. G. St. A. Mü.

[76] Eisele's report to the *KV*'s editorial board, October 10, 1916. Bachem Papers.

[77] Eisele's report, October 13, 1916. *Ibid.*

[78] Eisele's report, October 10, 1916. *Ibid.*

[79] Karl Bachem to Felix Porsch, April 18, 1917. *Ibid.*

[80] Karl Bachem, "Notes," April 28, 1917. *Ibid.*

lack of a principled position on war aims, which led them back into the camp of the party annexationists. By May the Christian Trade Unions and Catholic Workers' Associations were answering the plea of the Socialists for "a peace without annexations" with the statement that a *Machtfriede* was better than a peace of compromise.[81]

The extent to which the Center Party from right to left, from top to bottom, was committed to extensive peace aims suggests what a shock the sudden Erzberger peace action of July was to give the whole Center organization. And the way in which the trade unions, either out of tactical considerations or of acquiesence to public opinion, could jump from their moderate position of 1916 to the stand of May, 1917, offered no firm assurance of later stability.

Erzberger's motives and plans need only brief citation here. Long a sceptic on the submarine policy, he had learned that it would not end the war before the full entrance of the United States. High military commanders were dubious of a victory; and the Austrian government despaired of holding out beyond the fall of 1917. Erzberger also knew that the Vatican was preparing a peace action and that the Socialists intended to confront the Reichstag with a proposal of "peace without annexation." The Center deputy's plans were broad in scope. He intended to appeal to the Allies and to the war weary at home by identifying the Reichstag and the nation with "a peace of understanding and compromise" which would set the stage for the peace undertaking of Pope Benedict XV. To insure its execution and a favorable reception abroad he concerted with the Socialists and Progressives on a left-wing coalition. Erzberger likewise planned the replacement of Bethmann-Hollweg by Prince Bülow, who was also acceptable to some right-wing elements and who would follow the new majority and successfully represent Germany at the peace table. To create a better impression on the democratic Allies, Erzberger and his associates in the left-wing parties planned that the government should immediately introduce the Reichstag suffrage in Prussia and give autonomy to Alsace-Lorraine.[82]

[81] The statement on the *Machtfriede* was made by Adam Stegerwald, the leader of the Christian Trade Union movement. *WAZ*, May 20, 1917. The Catholic Workers' Associations had shortly before declared for a "peace of the sword." *Ibid.*

[82] Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 160, 170-172; Johannes Bell to Karl Bachem, February 5, 1932; February 22, 1932. Bachem Papers.

There is nothing in German parliamentary history which compares with the sudden success of Erzberger's relentless attack upon the government's war policy and upon his own party's leadership. He was too well briefed on the failures of the submarine campaign and on Germany's military position to be thwarted in debate by suddenly improvised defenses. Earlier straws cast into the wind by Erzberger had passed by without serious notice.[83] The conservative leaders put up a fight, but the hopelessness of their position was demonstrated by the fact that Spahn suffered a complete collapse under the strain of it. The trade union and Volksverein representatives were extremely loath to part with Bethmann-Hollweg and apparently defended him as long as they could.[84] The Bavarians put up an even more stubborn struggle over the tendencies toward parliamentarization implicit in the Erzberger proposal of co-operation with the left-wing parties.[85] Yet the tremendous drive either missed or by-passed its goal. Instead of Bülow, the emperor appointed Dr. Georg von Michaelis, an arch-conservative who gladly accepted the direction of Ludendorff.

The appointment of Michaelis with all of its later implications has led Rosenberg to write that Erzberger's prime mistakes were his failures to expose Ludendorff as the author of Germany's war policy and to carry parliamentarization to its logical conclusion.[86] However much one may agree with Rosenberg's first thesis, his second assumes that Erzberger's influence within the party was greater than it actually was. Whatever individual Center deputies might dare to say in party council in advocacy of parliamentary government—several representatives of the Volksverein and trade unions had already done so[87]—no Center politician dared take a public position on it. It is significant that the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, after its initial confusion, used the tactic that Erzberger's prime aim was the establishment of parliamentary control over the government, not the peace action itself. And even the *Germania*, although markedly under Erz-

[83] The *Centrums-Parlaments-Correspondenz* of June 12, 1917, carried extensive pessimistic comments from Erzberger on the German war situation. Karl Bachem made the notation: "Is this objective truth, or as so often before defeatism for a purpose?" *Ibid.*

[84] Eisele to the *KV*, July 14, 1917. *Ibid.*

[85] *Berliner Tageblatt*, July 12, 1917.

[86] Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-169.

[87] Karl Bachem to Felix Porsch, April 28, 1917. Bachem Papers.

berger's influence, insisted that the Center could not approve the introduction of a parliamentary system.[88]

The conservatives and the Bavarians chose to stress this question in their attack upon the party's new orientation. On the Bavarian Center's initiative the national council called a meeting of the national committee at Frankfurt on July 23-24. Martin Spahn spurred them on by pointing out that the introduction of the parliamentary system would mean the end of the traditional Prussia and Bavaria.[89] At the Frankfurt meeting the Bavarian leader, Heinrich Held, delivered a philippic against parliamentary government. It missed fire, however, because Erzberger was able to demonstrate that his intent was to secure appointment of competent deputies to governmental offices without making them responsible to their parties.[90]

Although Erzberger achieved a great success at Frankfurt it was by no means complete. The Bavarians and the conservatives refused to accept the Reichstag peace resolution, with the result that a subcommittee drew up a compromise resolution calling for "a peace of understanding and compromise which ensures Germany's political security and further economic development."[91] It is true that this statement could be brought into agreement with the original Erzberger resolution, if the Erzberger majority was the interpreting authority. But the fact remains that the national party had not chosen to affirm the resolution of its Reichstag delegation. The new resolution was an encouragement to loose interpretation of the Erzberger program, and the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* could claim, without conscious humor, that the Frankfurt resolution was identical with its own "Hindenburg peace."[92]

Nevertheless, Erzberger had a tight grip upon the Reichstag delegation, and that was the important factor in the late summer of 1917. Spahn had resigned from the party to become Prussian Minister of Justice, presumably because he despaired of regaining the leadership. He further strengthened Erzberger's position by loyally advising other conservatives to go along with the party's new policy.[93]

[88] *Germania,* July 9, 1917.
[89] Spahn to Heinrich Held (copy), July 19, 1917. Bachem Papers.
[90] Karl Bachem, "Notes," July 25, 1917. *Ibid.*
[91] Karl Bachem to Eisele, August 2, 1917. *Ibid.*
[92] *KV,* September 11, 1917.
[93] Karl Bachem, "Notes," January 10, 1918. Bachem Papers.

Gröber was bed-ridden, though as befitted a Centrist of his generation he complained "violently" about the Social Democrats' political gain from the new coalition and peace plan.[94] The nominal head of the party, Karl Trimborn, a member of the Julius Bachem school, was himself a moderate annexationist, but a sharp critic of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*. Trimborn was of a conciliating nature and held a realistic view of the political situation; therefore, he loyally supported the peace resolution and tried to make it palatable to critics within the party.[95] While conservatives like Porsch and the Bachem brothers, Karl and Franz, were bitter over the Erzberger action, feeling that it had destroyed the "fine national position" of German Catholicism and given strength to Social Democracy, they laid low for some months. In contrast to some reactionaries they showed a sense of responsibility. Having abandoned the fight against equal suffrage in Prussia after the emperor had promised its immedate introduction on July 11, they feared a division of the party just when it would be needed to defend the Church in that state.[96]

The possibilities of the peace resolution were actually never very real, since it depended upon the success of the papal peace effort of August, 1917. Nevertheless, the papal action gave Erzberger's critics some anxious moments and embarrassed them no end.[97] Even members of the hierarchy, who were sharply opposed to Erzberger because of his relationship with the Social Democrats, tried to exert influence behind the scenes on the annexationist press.[98] The *Kölnische Volkszeitung* followed the tactic of displaying respectful obeisance to the Vatican's action. But it stressed that the Pope was speaking as a neutral sovereign and not as head of the Church, that he was only concerned about the powers' "specific reaction to the general proposals on disarmament and arbitration," and not to the

[94] *U.A.* 4 Reihe, VII², 234.

[95] On Trimborn cf. Herman Cardauns, *Karl Trimborn* (München-Gladbach, 1921), pp. 177-179.

[96] Karl Bachem to Porsch, August 27, 1917. Bachem Papers.

[97] The Bavarian deputy, Franz Pfleger, wrote Eisele, "it goes far, very far against us. . . . we must evacuate Belgium, Northern France. . . . Poland becomes independent." August 18, 1917. Bachem Papers.

[98] Cardinal von Hartmann, Archbishop of Cologne, complained because the *KV* distinguished between the Pope as a religious and as a secular ruler. Letter to the editorial board, August 18, 1917. *Ibid.*

concrete proposals on Belgium and other occupied territories.[99] The long effort of the Center to convince non-Catholic Germans that the party was not subject to Vatican control, it warned, would be spoiled if the actions of the Holy See were linked up with the Reichstag peace resolution of Erzberger.[100]

The failure of the papal peace effort was the first setback to the Erzberger majority, and it was all the more serious because its causes were misunderstood. The Erzberger Centrists and their opponents only saw that the German government's response referred to both the peace resolution of the Reichstag and to the papal note and was courteous in tone; whereas the Allies were either formally polite or refused to notice it. What they did not know was that their own government had refused to give the Vatican the requested disavowal of any intent to maintain control over Belgium, a policy which nullified the Papacy's hopes of drawing England into negotiations.[101]

A further setback to the Erzberger majority was the appointment of Count Hertling as imperial chancellor in late October. As the military leaders had recognized as early as July, no better appointment could be made to neutralize Erzberger's leadership in the party and thus lame the whole Reichstag majority. Hertling had been a popular Center leader, and because of his combined scholarly and political activity he was probably the most widely known lay Catholic in Germany. His value as a counter-weight to Erzberger was all the greater because he was a progressive conservative. To Martin Spahn he was a "sham-conservative" of the Orleanist variety.[102] The obligation to introduce universal suffrage in Prussia posed no problem for a politician accustomed to the democratic franchise of Bavaria, and by his immediate attention to the question he could not help but create good-will for his administration in labor circles. He had already shown moderation on the submarine question, and

[99] *KV*, August 16, 1917. The *KV* deliberately avoided reference to Belgium.

[100] *KV*, August 14, 1917.

[101] Cf. Ernst Deuerlein, "Zur Friedensaktion Benedikts XV," in *Stimmen der Zeit*, CLV (January, 1955), 241-255. Also by the same author, *Der Bundesratsausschuss für die auswärtigen Angelegenheiten* (Regensburg, 1955), pp. 297-300.

[102] Martin Spahn, "Selbstbiographie," in *Deutscher Aufstieg* (Berlin, 1925), p. 484.

expressed keen distaste for the "jingoism" of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*.[103]

It is probably true that the new chancellor would have tried to live up to his promise to base his policy on the Reichstag's peace resolution if conditions had been different. But he made no further attempts to test his strength against Ludendorff after the military hero had insisted in late December, 1917, that the German government revoke its promise to the Russian government that the Peace of Brest-Litovsk would be based on the principle of national self-determination. Once he had suffered this setback Hertling did not find it hard to conform to a policy of annexations as Germany's hopes rose with the end of the war on the eastern front. Like most leading Centrists of his generation he had not been able to judge foreign affairs with any objectivity or healthy skepticism.[104] He also revealed the psychology of his Centrist contemporaries, Spahn, Gröber, Porsch, and Karl Bachem when he later said "Erzberger is the ruin of the Center party, of the Fatherland, and above all of the Catholic Church."[105] To these men who had known the *Kulturkampf* the peace movement could cost German Catholicism a dear price if the German nation were deprived of the fruits of victory.

The Center was faced, therefore, with the iron will of the popular military leadership which wanted a peace of conquest in both the East and West. In addition, party leaders found themselves in the quandary of trying to maintain the peace resolution and yet not attack a former member of the party who was also a distinguished Catholic leader. At the same time by January, 1918, a highly vocal anti-Erzberger movement had grown up in the national Center organization which successfully used the technique of playing up the gap between the Reichstag majority and the high command and the lack of agreement between Erzberger and the Catholic chancellor.

Originally disheartened, the Center conservatives and annexationists had slowly regained their confidence by the fall of 1917. The failure of the papal peace effort and the foundation of the *Vater-*

[103] Hertling to Herman Cardauns, June 18, 1917. Hertling's Letters to Cardauns (typewritten copies in hands of Dr. Ernst Deuerlein, Munich).

[104] In August, 1916, he told Karl von Wiegand, the American reporter, that England had begun the war with the intent of destroying Germany. Wiegand was amazed at the depth of emotion in such an aged man. *KV*, August 3, 1916.

[105] Eisele to the *KV*, March 22, 1918. Bachem Papers.

landspartei in September, 1917, had heightened their spirits. Since this new political movement aimed primarily at counteracting the influence of the peace resolution, it often attacked the Center Party; but conservative Centrists joined it in such numbers that the Reichstag delegation had to request that members of the party in the new organization leave it.[106] Regardless of the extent of Centrist participation in the annexationist party, the *Vaterlandspartei*, by reason of its aggressive and often unscrupulous propaganda, gave the anti-Erzberger forces a new sense of confidence and direction.

The opponents of the new Center orientation were a heterogeneous grouping but were hardly ineffectual because of their lack of homogeneity. They controlled the three leading newspapers in the Rhineland which had so long provided Catholic leadership on national questions: the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, the *Düsseldorfer Tageblatt*, and the *Essener Volksblatt*[107] to say nothing of numerous papers in other areas. The conservative labor leader Stegerwald lined up his Christian Trade Unions behind the cause of a victorious peace; his later course was to show that he had moved beyond his earlier moderate conservatism to a position close to Martin Spahn. Behind the scenes Cardinal von Hartmann let it be known that he disapproved of the new left-wing coalition; no annexationist himself, the Archbishop of Cologne did not disguise the fact that he looked with some favor upon the *Vaterlandspartei*[108] which was also waging a most vigorous campaign against the Social Democrats and the advocates of political change in Prussia.

The fine point of the Reichstag peace movement had become blunted by the time that the Reichstag began to discuss the peace negotiations of Brest-Litovsk in January, 1918. The fact that Constantine Fehrenbach, one of Erzberger's closest associates, wanted to disavow any further obligation to apply the principles of the peace resolution

[106] *KV*, October 15, 1917.

[107] The editor of the *Düsseldorfer Tageblatt*, Heinz Brauweiler, was intimate with Martin Spahn. Consul Stocky to Karl Trimborn (copy), October 12, 1918. *Ibid.* The *Essener Volksblatt* had long stood near to the *KV* on political issues. Wilhelm Hankamer, the editor, to Karl Bachem, April 18, 1917. *Ibid.*

[108] The Center leader in Hesse, Heinrich von Brentano, father of the present foreign minister of West Germany, complained that the *KV*'s tolerant treatment of the *Vaterlandspartei* enjoyed the approval of "high spiritual and lay circles" in Cologne, an obvious reference to the cardinal. Brentano to the *KV*, March 3, 1918. *Ibid.*

to the West,[109] suggests that the pressures of military success and conservatism had begun to work in the party councils. Erzberger and Trimborn still tried to draw an open declaration from the chancellor that Germany would free Belgium; but they did accept the results of the preliminary negotiations with the Communist diplomats at Brest-Litovsk. If the holding of plebescites would have been more in keeping with the intent and spirit of the Reichstag peace resolution, the Center spokesmen did not say so. They chose to recognize the existing national councils in the eastern states, earlier picked by the German authorities, as being representative of their peoples, subject to some broadening in individual cases.[110] When not speaking for the record, members of the Erzberger wing pessimistically acknowledged that they did not know whether it was worthwhile to refer to the peace resolution.[111]

The early successes of the Ludendorff offensive against the Allied armies in March speeded up the forces of erosion in the Center Party. Most of the party's leading members had accepted the peace program as a measure of hard necessity, and when fortunes improved they instinctively returned to the desire for a victorious peace.[112] Politically, too, it was the easiest course. The barometer of this change was Karl Trimborn, who had long served as the counterweight against Gröber, who had never been internally won over to the peace resolution. Trimborn's announcement on April 2 that Germany would have a free hand in the West meant in effect that the moderate conservatives in the Center were joining forces with the extreme conservatives at the expense of the Erzberger democrats.[113]

[109] Graf von Westarp, *op. cit.*, II, 566. Of course, Erzberger himself had never disclaimed his hope of securing Longway-Briey by negotiation; and his supporter, Eugen Bolz, stressed the fact that Germany could hope for an acquisition of territory under the Reichstag proposal of July, 1917. *Germania*, July 19, 1917. This indicates that they had early recognized the need to distinguish between the Socialist objective of "a peace without annexations" and their own peace by compromise, if the new orientation was to win wide support from Center voters.

[110] Zentrumsfraktion des Deutschen Reichstags, *Die Friedensdebatte im Hauptausschuss vom 24 bis 26 Januar 1918* (Berlin, 1918), pp. 25-26, 41-42.

[111] Haussmann, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

[112] Richard Müller, an Erzberger adviser, later said that only he and Erzberger among the party hierarchy really wanted a peace of compromise. Müller to Karl Bachem, August 1, 1929. Bachem Papers.

[113] Karl Bachem, "Notes," April 3, 1918. *Ibid.*

While Trimborn's action was partly due, no doubt, to a mixture of patriotic sentiment and tactical calculation, he and his circle had never been entirely easy in the close relationship with Erzberger because of the overthrow of Bethmann-Hollweg,[114] and one might assume because of the political consequences flowing from it.

The death knell of the peace resolution was actually sounded just a month later. The military authorities had made a shambles out of the settlement in the East, setting up a military dictatorship in the Ukraine, and negating all attempts of the national councils to gain sovereignty. The Hertling government had uttered no word of protest. Its internal program had likewise suffered shipwreck, for on April 30 a commission of the Prussian Landtag, after many months of fruitless debate, presented a resolution for plural suffrage. Erzberger and his associates apparently decided that this mockery of the Reichstag's program should be halted even if it meant the overthrow of Hertling. After securing Gröber's approval of several resolutions which would be presented to the government as the Reichstag's program for the eastern peoples, on May 8 Erzberger delivered a heavy attack against the official policies in force. But when Gröber and Fehrenbach became suspicious that this action could very well have the consequences of Erzberger's earlier attack on Bethmann-Hollweg, they insisted that the resolutions be withdrawn.[115]

The implications of this decision were clear. The leaders would not even defend the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the related treaties with the new eastern states, let alone the peace resolution, if it meant the overthrow of Hertling or his serious embarrassment. Hertling's overthrow would undoubtedly have brought a split in the party. The *Kölnische Volkszeitung* was quick to publicize the whole proceedings as an attempt on Erzberger's part to ruin the official who had followed a profitable course for Germany in the East and who wanted to do the same in the West.[116] The right wing of the party now thought that the opportunity had come to smash Erzberger's influence in party councils.[117] Erzberger's vigorous attempts to clear himself of having planned an attempt on the chancellor's

[114] Johannes Bell to Karl Bachem, December 14, 1932. *Ibid.*
[115] Eisele's reports to the *KV*, May 8 and 22, 1918. *Ibid.*
[116] *KV*, May 10, 1918.
[117] Karl Bachem to Lambert Lensing, May 15, 1918. Bachem Papers.

political life suggest how hopeless further aggressive moves were if the unity of the party was to be preserved.[118] Although the conservatives were disgruntled that the leaders did not strip him of his important committee posts, they recognized that the leaders would keep him under guard. Martin Spahn summarized the situation at the end of May in saying that Gröber's handling of Erzberger was unsatisfactory but that it did reveal the basic position of the party and the chancellor, and the military leaders could now move all the more emphatically toward the war goals they deemed necessary.[119]

In this bitter struggle between the friends and the foes of the peace resolution and the left-wing coalition, the line of division ran through social classes and not between them. In Baden, Württemberg, and in some parts of Bavaria, the local clergy, peasants, and lower middle class were strong supporters of the peace movement;[120] whereas in the Rhineland and Westphalia, where the peasants were organized under aristocratic leadership, this was not the case.[121] Some of Erzberger's defenders in the party's councils were deputies closely attached to the Volksverein like Wilhelm Marx, the later Weimar chancellor, and Johann Giesberts, the labor editor and deputy. The leader of the Christian Trade Unions, Stegerwald, continued to ridicule the "Kantongeist" of the southern democrats and their inability to appreciate the conservative state Prussia; though he was hardly less scathing in his criticism of the Catholic aristocracy which opposed suffrage reform.[122] The Catholic Workers' Association and the *WAZ* had been appreciative of Erzberger's total program; but it lapsed into silence on controversial issues, except for the cause of electoral reform. In mid-summer the *WAZ* suddenly broke its silence and defended again the aim of a victorious peace.[123]

[118] Erzberger to the editors, *KV*, May 16, 1918. *Ibid. Germania*, May 23, 1918.

[119] *Der Tag*, May 31, 1918. On June 9 the party passed a resolution to the effect that no single member could undertake major actions in the name of the party without the approval of its council. *Rheinische Westfälische Zeitung*, June 17, 1918.

[120] Eisele to the *KV*, May 2, 1918.

[121] Under Baron Klemens von Löe in the Rhineland; under Baron v. Kerckerinck zur Borg in Westphalia.

[122] Martin Spahn, *Der Tag*, August 17, 1918.

[123] Emil Ritter points out that the Volksverein had always stood closer to Stegerwald in its basic political viewpoint: whereas the *WAZ* and its editor,

As the Reichstag neared the conclusion of its work in the early summer of 1918 the Center's leaders concentrated more on problems of inner unity and post-war policies than on war aims. The party had not only to avert the dangers of secession and the possibility of attempts to form a new party, but it needed to look forward to the different problems of the future. It is significant that the Bavarian Center's leader, Held, took the lead in insisting that a personal quarrel between a Saxon nobleman and Erzberger should be settled within the party and not be permitted to reach the public.[124] The new *Richtlinien* drafted in June to facilitate the establishment of unity, however, were not slated to survive.[125] Germany's military collapse led, at Ludendorff's insistence, to the establishment of parliamentary government on September 30 and to the fall of Hertling. But the Erzberger leadership and its left-wing allies were no longer in a position to direct Germany's course. Forces beyond their control—the policy of Wilson and the desire of the masses for peace—brought on the revolution which was to reopen old wounds in the body of the Center Party.

University of Massachusetts

Joseph Joos, were attracted more to the democratic ideas of Erzberger and his pupil, Joseph Wirth. Ritter, *op. cit.*, pp. 388-389. On the *WAZ* and the question of war aims in 1918 cf. *WAZ*, July 21, 1918.

[124] Karl Bachem, "Notes," June 30, 1918. Bachem Papers.

[125] The whole controversial question of war aims was disposed of in the rather shapeless statement that the aim of German foreign policy should be "the securing and building-up of Germany's world position from a political, cultural, and economic viewpoint." The statement admits of several interpretations. Broschure in Wilhelm Marx Papers, Köln Stadtarchiv.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Butler's Lives of the Saints. Four volumes. Complete edition, edited, revised, and supplemented by Herbert Thurston, S.J., and Donald Attwater. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1956. Pp. xxxii, 720; xxi, 692; xx, 705; ix, 707. $39.50.)

In some quarters there seems to be misunderstanding concerning the extent of the revision of the text of *Butler's Lives of the Saints* which P. J. Kenedy has recently published in a handsome new format. In an article appearing August 6, 1956, under the heading of "Religion," *Time* called this edition "virtually a new work" and went on to say: "Some of Butler's saints have been eliminated by modern scholarship. . . . notably among the additions is St. John Cassian. . . . Other newcomers. . . . are Joan of Arc, Terese of Lisieux, Pope Pius X, Mother Cabrini, Father Isaac Joques and seven other French Jesuit Missionaries martyred by Indians. . . ."

Actually this edition is by no means a new work, nor does the editor make any such claims for it. The drastic revision of Butler's text was begun in 1925 (the date of publication of Volume I) by the late Father Herbert Thurston, noted Jesuit scholar and author, who alone revised and edited Volumes I and II; who then carried the work forward with the help of Norah Leeson through Volumes III-VI; and finally with the aid of Mr. Donald Attwater (who is responsible for the present edition) carried the work to completion through Volumes VII-XII. The last volume of this great work of revision was published in the year 1938.

A random comparison of some of the more important sketches of the previous work with those which appear in the present edition shows that many of them have been incorporated into the latter almost without change. Moreover, it was in the 1925-1938 edition that the sketches of SS. John Cassian, Joan of Arc, Térèse of Lisieux, and the Jesuit Martyrs of North America appeared for the first time. In the new edition these pieces have been repeated virtually without alteration except that to the sketch of Joan of Arc have been added several paragraphs dealing with the processes of rehabilitation and canonization and with some modern interpretations of the career of Joan which have become popular in the non-Catholic world since the appearance of the famous and oft reproduced play of G. B. Shaw, "Saint Joan." The sketch of the Jesuit martyrs

appears in this edition unchanged but under the date which the Church has assigned to their feast.

From the 1925-1938 edition Mr. Attwater has eliminated a number of briefer notices which by reason of the meagerness or the uncertainty of their information he considers to be without practical value. In their place, he has added many titles which he has deemed worthy of inclusion. In the present edition, moreover, Mr. Attwater has completely eliminated the homilies with which Butler concluded the first and principal entry for each day. These homilies had already been shortened and revised by Father Thurston, but Mr. Attwater has decided that their value was not proportionate to the space they occupied. The greatest value of his new edition probably derives from the sketches of recently canonized saints, such as Pope Pius X, Mother Cabrini, and Maria Goretti.

Those who are not in possession of the 1925-1938 edition, unattractively printed and bound, are fortunate to be able to obtain the complete work brought up to date in four volumes with a handsome format at a cost less than that for which the previous twelve-volume edition could have been reproduced. Many owners of the previous edition undoubtedly will wish to obtain the new edition for the sake of the new material which it contains.

✠ Lawrence J. Shehan
Bishop of Bridgeport

The Papacy: a Brief History. By James A. Corbett. (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. 191. $1.25.)

This small volume is No. 12 in Van Nostrand's paper-back series, Anvil Books. It contains eighty-seven pages of text and ninety pages of illustrative documents, and was written specially for the series by Professor Corbett of the University of Notre Dame. In so brief a survey of so vast a subject the author has no option but to present the many-sided reality under a single aspect, taking the opportunity whenever he can to suggest at least the existence of others. Professor Corbett chose to present the papacy chiefly in its relations with the temporal power as embodied first in the Roman and Byzantine empires, then in feudal Europe, and finally in the modern nation states. It was a wise choice which enabled him to bring forward the essential information relevant to many of the questions which the ordinary reader today is likely to have regarding the central institution of the Catholic Church.

When one must be brief it is difficult to be balanced; this difficulty is often successfully met, as in the judicious paragraph (p. 64) where Professor Corbett formulates the dilemma that confronted the papacy in

the age of the absolute monarchs. Occasionally, however, complex developments are referred to in short-hand terms intelligible only to the specialist, as when the "confusion of the spiritual and temporal powers" in the eighth century is attributed to the fact that "the Roman natural-law origin of the State had become blurred and forgotten and was replaced by the political Augustinism which made the Catholic faith the basis of civilization" (p. 23). A few sentences explaining political Augustinism (presumably used in the sense given to it by Arquillière), how exactly it makes the Catholic faith the basis of civilization, and in what it differs from the natural-law concept of the state would seem to be necessary at this point.

It might have been possible to bring out more clearly the ecumenical character of the papacy even without unduly stretching the limits of the book. Save for a passing reference to the part played by the popes in the conversion of Britain and Germany, no mention is made of their missionary role. Yet this is what chiefly relates the papacy to the non-European world and reveals it to be more than a merely European institution. Moreover, the growth of the complex structure known as the royal "patronage" of the Church in the Spanish and Portuguese dominions from the initial concessions of Alexander VI and his immediate successors is an important phase in the development of Church-State relations and hence falls directly within the angle of vision selected by Professor Corbett.

The choice of documents to illustrate the text, made chiefly from the larger collection of Ehler and Morrall, is on the whole a judicious one.

HORACIO DE LA COSTA

Ateneo de Manila

Master Alcuin, Liturgist. By Gerald Ellard, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola University Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 266. $4.00.)

This is not a full biography of one of the central figures in the Carolingian renaissance. For such the author points us to Arthur Kleinclausz' *Alcuin* and to Eleanor Duckett's *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne*. What Father Ellard furnishes is a scholarly study in survey of the work that has been done up to the present in specialist literature, and particularly in regard to the activity of the headmaster of Charlemagne's palace school in the field of liturgy. Charlemagne, in his determination to secure Roman liturgical standards throughout his realm, found his chief agent in the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin. In the Anglo-Saxon area Roman standards had been established—from the first missionary project of

Pope Gregory I— by such leaders as Augustine of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus, and Wilfrid of York. Thus the Anglo-Saxon Boniface, in his missionary work in Germany and in his reform work in Gaul, all under Roman authority and with the support of Charles Martel and Pepin, laid the foundation for the Carolingian promotion of Roman conformity through the work of Master Alcuin.

Father Ellard deals with Alcuin's concern for liturgical chant, for the rite of baptism, for the use of the creed in the Mass, his provision of homilies and lectionary selections, his work on the Vulgate text of the Bible, and above all his far-reaching influence on the text of the Mass liturgy. Taking as standard a copy of the Roman sacramentary sent to Charlemagne by Pope Hadrian I, Alcuin added a supplement of additions of Gallican and remote Roman origin, and so produced what is substantially our missal of today. For in the ninth and tenth centuries when political disorder checked the liturgical developments in Rome, and when order was restored by the northern aid of Cluniac monks and Ottonian emperors, it was the model text of the Mass prepared by Alcuin that came to prevail in Rome also. The Carolingian renaissance was to pass into political and cultural decline; but there is one broad path linking the culture of that time with our own, that is, "this Latin liturgy which while Roman in origin had been indelibly tempered after the manner of the Franks by the Anglo-Saxon Master Alcuin, liturgist."

WILLIAM BUSCH

The St. Paul Seminary

La Presqu'île des caloyers: Le Mont-Athos. By Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta. Préface de M. Pierre Pascal, professor à la Sorbonne (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer. 1955. Pp. ix, 388. 240 frs. belges.)

In the afternoon of Sunday, August 14, 1949, Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, a Belgian scholar who for a fortnight had been studying manuscripts of the homilies of St. Basil of Caesarea in the monasteries of Mount Athos, was in conversation with the governor general of the famous peninsula of the "kalogeroi," the "good old men," asking permission to prolong his stay on the Holy Mountain. Not only was his request granted, but upon remarking that he was recording his impressions in a diary, he was strongly urged by the high official with whom he was speaking, to prepare this material for publication. The suggestion was felicitous, as the present volume proves, for we have here another book on Mount Athos, altogether worthy of a place beside its many excellent predecessors: the brisk essay of Fallmerayer of more than a

century ago (recently reprinted), the larger work of Athelstan Riley, which appeared some forty years later, to say nothing of the important publications of more recent date produced by such scholars as H. Brockhaus, Ph. Meyer, H. Gelzer, P. De Meester, F. W. Hasluck, C. Korolevskij, M. Choukas, R. M. Dawkins, Gabriel Millet, Franz Dölger—to mention a few outstanding names among many.

Amand de Mendieta's book is a *livre d'occasion,* and does not, therefore, present a systematic, still less an exhaustive study of the one or the other phase or aspect of the rich traditions of Mount Athos. It is rather an exposition of the author's many and varied impressions gleaned during his pursuit of manuscripts. But these impressions, it must be said at once, are presented in an exceptionally elaborate and unusually interesting form. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the constant reference to all the more important relevant literature. The documentation is, in fact, copious. Whether the author is describing the beauty of the landscape and refers incidentally to Fallmerayer's fine prose, or in passing, for he did not visit it, summarizes the history of Xeropotamou, and in a footnote gives the results of Stéphane Binon's work on the eighteenth-century forgeries of this monastery, the reader is always put in touch with the best and the most recent work on the particular topic under discussion. Where so many monuments, large and small—churches, and their decoration, reliquaries, icons, and liturgical appurtenances—are mentioned and described at greater or less length, these references to the specialized literature are a strong incentive to the student and a satisfaction to any and every reader. The church of Iveron, e.g., was the first *katholikon* on Mount Athos which the author had an opportunity to survey at leisure. Accordingly, we are given not merely a description of the general plan of the church but a rather detailed account also of the scheme of decoration with a reference to Fritz Fichtner's chapter on this subject in his monograph published in 1931. But if the remark is not ungracious at so rich a feast, an additional reference at this point to the earlier publication of Brockhaus might have proved helpful to more than one reader to whom the more recent work is inaccessible. At Iveron also the author assisted at vespers (*hesperinos*). He notes the offensive speed of the psalmody, a vice by no means confined to Mount Athos. By contrast, the same office at Vatopedi several days later was recited with less speed and, in general, the ceremonies were here carried out with considerably more exactitude and dignity. The feast of the Dormition of Our Lady the author spent at the Laura of St. Athanasius, and in this connection he gives us a description of the liturgical vigil (*agrypnia*). He did not himself have the hardihood to spend twelve continuous hours in church, but he gives us, nonetheless, a brief analysis of the principal offices performed during that time, especially of the morning office, *Orthros* (matins

and lauds). This description may well be recommended to anyone wishing to make a first acquaintance with this intricate *akolouthia*, especially since the student will find here one or two bibliographical references of considerable value. This same monastery of the Laura has the largest refectory (*trapeza*) on the Holy Mountain, with accommodations for 800 persons and more. In the first half of the sixteenth century it was richly decked out by Frangos Catellanos of the Cretan school with several great cycles of frescoes to the description of which our author devotes seven pages of unusual interest. But to return for the moment to the author's comments on liturgical functions, it was at the Russian monastery of Panteleemon that he found the Sunday liturgy exceptionally impressive. In fact, his account of this experience includes some of the most profound and most striking sentences in the entire volume.

The author writes with sympathy and understanding, but is no romantic enthusiast. In the cenobitic monasteries (he visited four of them: Koutloumousiou, Dionysiou, Gregoriou, Panteleemonos), in contrast with the idiorrhythmic, he found the food "execrable." In general, buildings were in a bad state of repair, and the appearance of their occupants by no means in conformity with ordinary standards of cleanliness and neatness. Lack of education, too, leads to many strange notions: in the opinion of the other monks of the Holy Mountain, e.g., the community of Vatopedi is as heretical as the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Pope of Rome himself for having adopted the Gregorian calendar. But none of these shortcomings lessens Amand de Mendieta's appreciation of the positive values he finds represented on Mount Athos. The most serious problem of all which the monastic republic faces is its steadily diminishing population. In the Russian church of Panteleemon, e.g., which has 600 stalls, the community present at the Sunday liturgy numbered twenty-eight in all. At the beginning of this century, Iveron had a community of more than 200; by 1949 their number had shrunk to forty. In 1903, Vatopedi had 178 monks; in 1949, forty-five. In the ten monasteries which he visited (and they were the most important), the author found a sum total of three novices.

Brief mention must be made also in this review of the compact and richly documented history of Mount Athos from the ninth century to the present day, a chapter of fifty-seven pages, the first in the volume, and of the two following chapters which contain an analysis of the *Constitutional Charter of Mt. Athos*, approved by the *Extraordinary and Double Assembly of Mt. Athos* on May 10, 1924, and confirmed by a legislative decree of the Greek government on September 10, 1926—material previously summarized for English readers in an altogether satisfactory, but perhaps somewhat less detailed and less intimate manner, by the sociologist, Professor Michael Choukas, in chapter five

("Theocracy") of his Columbia University dissertation, *Black Angels of Athos.* Amand de Mendieta had the good fortune of being assisted in the preparation of these two chapters by the Governor General of the Holy Mountain, Panaghiotes Panaghiotakos, himself a canonist of distinction. These three initial chapters and the concluding one on the "Mystical and Ascetical Ideal of the Monk of Mt. Athos" constitute the framework within which the author encloses the account of his wanderings back and forth on the peninsula from monastery to monastery.

But this all too brief summary of the volume would be quite incomplete, if the bibliography appended by the author were left unnoticed. It is divided into two sections. The first is a special bibliography on Mount Athos itself comprising 160 titles, concerning nearly every one of which a short critical note is added giving a more or less definite idea of its value and importance. The second bibliography, which includes seventy-seven titles, deals with the background of Mount Athos, i.e., the history of the Byzantine Empire, the Orthodox Church past and present, Byzantine liturgy, Byzantine art, Byzantine monachism. This list is, of course, far from exhaustive, nor indeed is it meant to be, but every student will be grateful for it.

ANSELM STRITTMATTER

St. Anselm's Priory
Washington

Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury. By Avrom Saltman. (London: University of London: Athlone Press; New York; John de Graff, Inc. 1956. Pp. xvi, 594. $8.00.)

This is an excellent study of the career of the predecessor of Thomas Becket in the See of Canterbury. Perhaps because his accomplishments were inevitably overshadowed by those of his illustrious successor, no mediaeval biographer left a complete record of Theobald's life, and until recently modern historians have not given him the attention he deserves. Indeed, precisely because Theobald's career lacks the spectacular quality of Becket's, it serves to illustrate the operations of the English Church under more normal circumstances.

Theobald's tenure (1138-1161) fell in a period when the effects of ecclesiastical centralization and the advance of papal authority were being felt in England. It was his task, therefore, to adjust his policies to the new procedures. Others have pointed to Theobald's probable contribution to the introduction of the new systematic canon law into England. What Dr. Saltman has added is a more detailed analysis of the manner in

which the archbishop, although occasionally resentful of diminishing archiepiscopal authority, encouraged and promoted its development. His discussion includes Theobald's relations with the English monasteries and with his fellow bishops. In all these matters, and especially in connection with episcopal and abbatial elections and revenues, the crown was also involved. For during these years which included most of Stephen's reign and the early period of Henry II, the English government also found itself forced to make many adjustments to the new situation. As is well known, Henry II tried to reverse the trend and to restore what he regarded as a normal royal authority in ecclesiastical matters. The beginnings of later controversies are apparent here.

A chapter on the archiepiscopal household, itself an important institution and the training ground for four future archbishops and six bishops, includes some interesting observations on Becket's early years, John of Salisbury, and the lawyer Vacarius. Dr. Saltman has also appended the full Latin text of over 300 charters with a discussion of the subject matter and style.

This volume is an important contribution to the history of the English Church. It should also prove useful to those students of general mediaeval history who so often find themselves forced to rely on broad generalizations. For those of us who lecture or write about the development of canon law, here are actual examples. Here we can see what typical individual cases were like, how and why they were taken from the court of first instance to a higher court and eventually, perhaps, to a papal judge. In addition to the charters there is an extensive bibliography and index.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN

New York University

The Letters of John of Salisbury. Volume I. *The Early Letters (1153-1161).* Edited by W. J. Millor, S.J., and H. E. Butler, revised by C. N. L. Brooks. [Medieval Texts. General Editors V. H. Galbraith and R. A. B. Mynors.] (New York: Oxford University Press; London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd. 1955. Pp. lxvii, 1-296 [1-251 duplicate paging] $8.00.)

John of Salisbury, a refined representative of the practical and philosophical humanism of the twelfth century, adhered in his letter-writing technique to the tradition of the school of Chartres, using the classics as a treasury of examples, never separating wisdom from eloquence. The tone of his letters is more encyclopedic than personal, carefully avoiding verbalism and logomachy. For him, as Gilson writes, the true philosopher

is the man "who lives the doctrine he preaches." In his letters, therefore, he avoids offending anyone; he is careful not to misjudge people, for this according to him, is the result of "perversity of mind" (p. 149).

The principal figures in the first part of his correspondence, here edited and translated, are Theobald of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Peter of Celle, Abbot of Moutier-la Celle, outside of Troyes. John joined the curia of Theobald in 1148 and became the archbishop's secretary and adviser in the difficult legal cases connected with the administration of his diocese. So, as one would expect, these letters provide us with intimate glimpses into the appeals and canonical procedures of the pontificate of Adrian IV (1154-1159) and give vivid accounts of the reign of Henry II.

The whole collection, ***uasculum litterarum,*** was put together around 1162 for the benefit of Peter of Celles, John's former master and devoted friend, who helped him to "enjoy the benefits of a citizen in a foreign country" (p. 55). The letters bear the marks of John's wide reading and of his intellectual and moral formation. His eloquence and wisdom result in wise sayings such as would fit into maximes of La Rochfoucauld. With charming simplicity he finds a way to use the popular proverbs of his time, e.g., "Where love is, there is the eye" (p. 150), always leaving a door open for solid humor: "Sometimes a man who seeks to protect his face by making the sign of the cross injures his nose or pokes out his eye" (p. 148). Furthermore, the letters offer precious information on the schools of the twelfth century, on Orleans, Lisieux, Rheims, and on the much revered "partnership of mind" of famous masters. In the notes on the schools of Orleans (p. 176, note 6), besides Rashdall's work on the universities, a reference to E. Lesne, *Les écoles de la fin du VIII^e^ siècle à la fin du XII^e^* (Lille, 1940), pp. 175-191, would have been a valuable addition.

The first collection of John's letters, ending with the death of his employer, Archbishop Theobald, was written between 1153-1161. It comprises 135 letters. Their chronological order is carefully established by the general editors of the series, who have filled the gap for 1158-1159 between the two series of dated letters (1156-7; 1159-61) with the undated ones. The first edition of John's letters was published in Paris by Jean Masson in 1611, reprinted in the *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum* (Lugduni, 1677), XXIII, 410-[452]-535. The edition of J. A. Giles appeared in Oxford in 1848 and was reprinted in the *PL*, 199. The present edition is based on three manuscripts: Paris, B.N. Lat. 8625 (P), Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Ms. Ii 2.31 (C), and Vatican, Lat. 6024, which is a copy of *P*. For letters 99, 134, and 135 the general editor, R. A. B. Mynors, used also other sources (p. lxi).

The text of the present edition is taken from the Paris ms: B.N. Lat. 8625 by Father Millor, S.J., who prepared the critical edition of the

letters. The translation, begun by the late H. E. Butler, was revised and completed by C. N. L. Brooke, fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, who also wrote the excellent introduction to the letters and prepared the notes and appendices. The appendices consist of separate and profound studies on various problems, such as John of Salisbury's stay at the papal curia and legal opinions on marriage law in mid-twelfth-century England; a particularly splendid analysis is given of letter 131, pertaining to the question, much disputed by the Bolognese, Roman, and Paris schools, on "What constitutes a marriage." There are lists of biblical, classical, patristic, and mediaeval quotations and of the dates and recipients of the letters. These lists and the very good general index are worthy of this accurate yet not slavish translation. A sincere compliment should be given to V. H. Galbraith and R. A. B. Mynors, general editors of the series of mediaeval texts.

ASTRIK L. GABRIEL

Mediaeval Institute
University of Notre Dame

St. Francis of Assisi. A Pictorial Biography. By Leonard von Matt and Walter Hauser. Translated from the German by Sebastian Bullough, O.P. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1956. Pp. vi, 106. $6.50.)

This book, the beauty of which cannot be praised too highly, might also have been sub-titled "A Pilgrimage to Franciscan Italy." It consists of 200 superb photographs of places and things connected with St. Francis, each four pages of pictures alternating with a page of text. The photos, all full or quarter page (octavo), by the noted Swiss photographer, Leonard von Matt, are reproduced from plates made in Switzerland and are remarkably clear and detailed. It almost seems that the artist—and here the photographer is an artist in the best sense of the word—has caught the very atmosphere with his lens. One who has visited these entrancing scenes will recapture something of the same soul-satisfying thrill that he experienced when he stood in the same surroundings. The choice of subjects could scarcely have been better.

The text, originally in German, was written by Father Walter Hauser of the Canton of Uri, Switzerland, where he is favorably known for his inspiring religious poetry. The soul of the poet breathes in every page of the prose; yet Franciscan history has never been written more briefly nor more accurately. "In few and simple words," the author retells Francis' story without any of the controversies that have arisen about it in the course of time, and without cluttering the text with quotations

from the sources. Father Bullough, O.P., has preserved the spirit and style of the original in an excellent English translation. While the text was not intended to be an explanation of the pictures, together they form an admirable background for a clearer understanding of things Franciscan. Facing every group of four pictures (all bleeders), are the captions and explanatory notes—a rather unusual, but highly satisfactory arrangement. Two full-page maps in black and white and an index of the plates are welcome additions.

The format, quality of paper, binding, and type are far better than one might expect in a book at such a moderate price. It should solve many a gift problem; and it belongs in the library of every lover of St. Francis and every lover of beautiful books.

VICTOR E. MILLS

Holy Name College
Washington, D. C.

Saint John Fisher. By E. E. Reynolds. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1956. Pp. xiii, 310. $6.00.)

This is a very good biography of the saint. John Fisher, becoming Bishop of Rochester in 1504 as a young man of thirty-five and dying on June 22, 1535, was the most notable of all the bishops of King Henry VIII of England. He was famous as a theologian, for his great interest and work for higher education, and for the zeal with which he pursued his episcopal duties. Though he was not alone among the bishops who resisted the anti-papal policies of Henry VIII, he was the only one who resisted them to the sacrifice of his own life.

Hitherto the chief life of Saint John Fisher has been that written nearly seventy years ago by Father Thomas E. Bridgett, C.SS.R. Since then much fresh material of every kind concerning the Tudor period has come to our notice. Accordingly, e.g., Mr. Reynolds has been able to make a close study of Bishop Fisher's episcopal registers and of the texts of sermons hitherto inadequately used. An appendix examines Saint John Fisher's relatives and comments on their careers. The index begins with a chronological outline of the life of Fisher in detail, including his writings, his sermons, and his correspondence. With regard to the general index, it might have been well if it had included references to the footnotes. In addition, there should have been a list of authorities used fuller than that provided at the beginning of the book under the heading, "Chief References." Thus, e.g., authorities are referred to in the footnotes under a brief title, and it is tiresome to have to hunt for the com-

plete title in some earlier footnote. The author excuses himself from providing a bibliography by a general reference "to the full bibliography published in 1955 by the Oxford Bibliographical Society" (p. xiii).

The author has written other biographies, notably one of Saint John Fisher's contemporary martyr, Saint Thomas More. Although he makes reference to Father Philip Hughes' first volume of *The Reformation in England,* the second volume of Father Hughes' great work came out probably too recently for the author to refer to the very full treatment that Father Hughes gave to Foxe's *Book of Martyrs.* Nor does there seem to be any reference to the study of the Tudor bishops by Lacey Baldwin Smith entitled *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (Princeton, 1953). While the author has provided us with a sound life of the bishop, yet he does not, of course, enter into any study of the Reformation and the general attitude of Tudor priests and bishops. The volume has been well produced. There are numerous and excellent illustrations, and the proof-reading has been very good. Only one lapse was noted on page 214.

ERIC MCDERMOTT

Georgetown University

Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563. By Robert M. Kingdon. [Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XXII] (Genève: Librairie E. Droz. 1956. Pp. ix, 163. 22 frs. s.)

The object of this volume "is to test the hypothesis that the Geneva Company [of Pastors] directed the religious agitation" preceding the first of the religious wars which broke out in France in 1562 (preface). After a very careful and extensive examination of the evidence, the author finds the hypothesis valid and, in what is really a summary of the second half of the book, he concludes that when the revolution did come Geneva, the central authority of Calvinism, though in theory a nonbelligerent, in practice still served as the fountainhead. It was the prime source of ecclesiastical leaders and the outpouring of printed propaganda; it was a staging-base for conspiracies, a negotiating point for loans, and a producer and distributor of armament (p. 129).

Dr. Kingdon divides his study into two main sections: Part I analyzes quite competently, and in as much detail as the evidence allows, the background, training, certification, placement, and discipline of eighty-eight Calvinist pastors sent by the Geneva Company of Pastors to the Calvinist congregations of France during the critical years 1555-1563; Part II narrates the role which some of these pastors and their fellow-workers in Geneva and France "actually took in the rising tide of political intrigue

in France" (preface). Both sections add fascinating detail to the history of the relations between Geneva and France.

The author has done extensive research in the archives of Geneva and has drawn much of his material from the unpublished records of the Company of Pastors and the municipal council of the city. Some of the source material seems to have been exasperating, but where secrecy and the clandestine are necessary features of a series of historical events, and especially where so many of the sources are, as in this case, official documents, one must, I suppose, expect some intractability in his material. Dr. Kingdon has consistently respected the limits to which the sources confine him. Whenever he dares to look beyond the barriers, he has done so tentatively and has not failed to indicate the lack of positive evidence. The reviewer is not inclined, however, to follow the author on each excursion into the realm of the possible, as, e.g., in this instance:

> If Calvinism had been able to gain favor with the French Crown, Catholic parish priests would perhaps have been induced to enter the Reformed Church, as they were led to do in England and Germany, bringing with them their peasant flocks (p. 8).

The book has a satisfactory index, a good critical bibliography, although it seems a little condescending to refer to Imbart de la Tour as "a tolerant Catholic scholar" (p. 155), and seven detailed appendices which bear principally on Part I. An English language volume printed in a foreign land, the book is remarkably free of typographical errors. Dr. Kingdon's excellent study is a solid contribution to Reformation history.

MAURICE F. REIDY

College of the Holy Cross

Commentarii Ignatiani: 1556-1956. (Romae: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu. 1956. Pp. 615. $5.60.)

Commentarii Ignatiani: 1556-1956 constitutes Fascicle 49 (January-June, 1956) of the *ARCHIVUM HISTORICUM SOCIETATIS IESU* and is a parallel to the *Commentarii S. Francisco Xaverio Sacri: 1552-1952,* which appeared as Fascicle 43 (January-June, 1953) of the same periodical. This is a memorial volume celebrating the fourth centenary of the death of Saint Ignatius Loyola. It is a symposium of twenty-nine papers in six languages: Spanish (14), French (5), English (4), German (3), Italian (2), and Latin (1). Each paper is a well documented study, and each is preceded by a very brief summary of its contents in

Latin. The volume is divided into two parts: part one (pp. 7-240) consists of thirteen papers bearing on the life and deeds of Saint Ignatius; part two (pp. 243-612) consists of the remaining sixteen essays which are devoted to Ignatius' writings and teachings.

Limitations of space preclude listing all the authors and their contributions. Nor does it seem fair to the other authors to single out but a few for special mention. And yet I do not feel it is a slight to them if I draw the attention of English readers to the four English items, because these seem to have a particular interest and usefulness for them. Father Crehan in "Saint Ignatius and Cardinal Pole" writes about the friendship that existed between these two men and the desire of Saint Ignatius to deploy some of his best men in England in order to assist in the Catholic restoration under Mary Tudor and to consolidate the gains made for the Church. Though Pole, the papal legate, did not invite the Jesuits for some reason or other, the failure of the Jesuits to enter England at this opportune time seems to be charged against Ribadaneira.

In "Richard Whitford and St. Ignatius' Visit to England" Father Peters discusses the likelihood of Saint Ignatius' stay in 1530 at Syon Monastery near London and that he very probably there met and came under the influence of Richard Whitford, a monk of the said monastery. Many similarities between Whitford's ascetical writings and Saint Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises* are adduced as possibly supporting his thesis. "Pioneer Jesuit Apostles among the Indians of New Spain (1572-1604)" by Ernest J. Burrus reveals that 109 of the early Jesuits consecrated themselves to the Indian apostolate. A biographical dictionary of these missioners concludes this essay. George E. Ganss in "Saint Ignatius the Educator, Guide amid Contemporary Problems" presents Saint Ignatius' fourteen cardinal principles of Catholic higher education.

GEORGE J. UNDREINER

Pontifical College Josephinum

Diplomatic Archive of Chios: 1577-1841. By Philip P. Argenti. Two Volumes. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1954. Pp. xliv, 457; 461-1117. $37.50 per set).

The author, who is a corresponding member of the Academy of Athens, is peculiarly qualified for the task he has accomplished, for he has already published several learned works on Chios during the last twenty years or more. Due to the dearth of Greek primary sources the author has gone to foreign official records. The result is a collection of primary sources—largely reports by diplomatic and consular agents—

drawn from various western archives and records offices. The documents, 516 in number, in Latin, French, Italian, German, Dutch, and English while dealing principally with Chios contain also material relating to other parts of Greece.

There are six major divisions of matter: physical structure, topography, political history consisting largely of naval actions, economic and social history, and religion. It is this last division, which treats of the Catholic Church and its relations with the Greek Orthodox Church, that we wish to consider in this review. While the whole work covers the years 1577-1841, thus dealing with the greater part of the Turkish period of Chian history, the documents in this section on religion, which takes up well over 200 pages, begin with the middle of the fourteenth century. It might be remarked in passing that as all these documents are drawn from western sources, one might feel that the Greek point of view has not been given adequate representation. In the picture presented by the documents we see the constant friction between Catholics and schismatics, the persecution to which the Catholics were exposed, the attempts of the Orthodox to control them, the appeals of the Catholics to Rome for help, the interest manifested in all this by the official representatives of the western powers, the whole being complicated by the sovereign power of the Sublime Porte over Chios.

Those interested in the history of the religious orders will find much to hold their attention in the varying fortunes that accompanied their attempts to build or rebuild churches, instruct children, and in general to sustain the faith of the Christians. The introduction is excellent and there is a closely detailed and decidedly helpful index. A digest of the contents placed at the head of each document would greatly facilitate a rapid consultation of the whole work.

EDWARD HAGEMANN

Alma College

Martyr in Scotland. Blessed John Ogilvie: His Life and Times. By Thomas Collins. (London: Burns & Oates. 1955. Pp. xi, 268. 21/s.)

In *Martyr in Scotland* Thomas Collins provides a sound and readable account of the short missionary life in early seventeenth-century Scotland of Blessed John Ogilvie. This Jesuit was one of those courageous priests of the Catholic Reformation, among whom Edmund Campion is the most celebrated, who returned from continental seminaries to their native land to minister to their persecuted brethren. Less than a year after his arrival in Scotland Ogilvie was arrested and great efforts were made

to prove him guilty of treason on political rather than religious grounds. He was subjected to eight days and nine nights of enforced sleeplessness in order to make him incriminate himself, but he did not yield.

Though the author disclaims erudition for his book, he shows considerable knowledge of the Scottish history of the time, particularly of Scottish family history. The chief merit of the work, so far as the historian is concerned, lies in the attention which the author gives to the problem of religious tolerance and to the conflicting claims of Church and State which bring about Ogilvie's martyrdom. These issues, always important but of particular relevance to the Catholic Reformation, are not always understood, even by professional historians who are sometimes scarcely aware that such problems can be vital. Ogilvie's great difficulty lay in being forced by his persecutors to distinguish between the claims of God and Caesar in a Christendom, only recently rent by the Protestant Revolt, where the Catholic attitude to Protestant governments had not been fully clarified.

John Ogilvie emerges from Mr. Collins' book as a priest of high courage and possessing something of the rare wit and sense of humor of Saint Thomas More. The author shows a truly historical approach to his subject in being careful to limit his conclusions to what is warranted by the evidence. There is, perhaps, one lapse from this high standard in the doubt which he throws on the sincerity of Archbishop Spottiswoode and other Protestant religious leaders. Personal faults and doctrinal illogicalities are not in themselves sufficient proof of insincerity in religious belief. On the whole, however, the author writes in a dispassionate and objective manner and never makes any improper appeal to the "moral indignation" of the reader.

Though the specialist will need to plough deeper, the general student of history will find *Martyr in Scotland* a useful and interesting study in Church and State relations at the time of the Catholic Reformation.

MAURICE R. O'CONNELL

University of Pennsylvania

The Archbishop and the Lady. The Story of Fénelon and Madame Guyon. By Michael de la Bedoyere. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1956. Pp. 256. $3.50.)

This is the first book ever written in English by a Catholic on Madame Guyon and the controversies, theological and political, in which she played so prominent a part. If her story has not been told before, it is not because it is uninteresting or inimportant, but because it is so complicated and the material so abundant. To treat of it definitively would require familiarity

with the structure and operation of the French state under Louis XIV, the reciprocal relations of the king, the Holy See, and the French bishops, with the teaching and intrigues of the Gallicans and the Jansenists, the influence of foreign affairs on the ecclesiastical policy of Louis XIV, and, last but not least, a theological competence in the study of quietism in its various aspects. Against such a background one should place the conflict in which the chief actors were Bossuet, Fénelon, Madame de Maintenon, Louis XIV, and Madame Guyon. Fortunately, Mr. de la Bedoyere has not waited to fulfill all these conditions, but has chosen instead to give us a well-written popular study, based entirely on secondary sources, which, especially when supplemented by the relevant chapters in Knox's *Enthusiasm* (London, 1950), is likely to hold the field for a long time. Readers anxious for additional material will find a short bibliography of the principal French sources.

Madame Guyon's historical importance is due chiefly to the conflict between Bossuet and Fénelon of which she was the cause. Any conflict between two such highly placed, gifted, and dissimilar personalities would have its interest, but when it was on a theological issue and involved the most influential people at the French court, plus a formidable prophetess, it developed a special interest which it still retains. That interest is heightened by the methods to which Bossuet stooped, both in Rome where he had to rely on pressure and intrigue, and in France where he was able, in addition, to invoke the secular arm. Quietism and semi-quietism have long ceased to be important, but the reaction they provoked and the means by which they were crushed had consequences that are with us yet. Bossuet won, but he tarnished his name; Fénelon lost on points, but he emerged the bigger man. The author follows most modern writers in reaching this verdict. Bossuet and Fénelon have often been compared to Manning and Newman; but there is this important difference: the French Manning was the greater preacher and, at least on the point at issue, the sounder theologian.

The brilliance of her great friends and enemies has obscured the fact that both as a person and as a type Madame Guyon is well worth studying for her own sake. She deserves a prominent place in the long line of intelligent, devout, affluent, and energetic but poorly trained, imaginative, and essentially intractable ladies who have occupied themselves with theological matters and with spiritual direction. That the consequences of her activity were disastrous for herself and the cause she aimed to serve did not lessen her enthusiasm or teach her the nature of her errors and mistakes. There was more than a touch of Margery Kempe and Mary Baker Eddy in her.

Though no Catholic can regret the condemnation of her errors, and many may be more willing than Mr. de la Bedoyere is to sympathize

with superiors who found her dangerous and exasperating, it is impossible not to agree with him that she was treated with quite unjustifiable harshness. The cause of orthodoxy would have been strengthened if its guardians had respected the basic human rights both Church and State ignored so readily at that time. Both the admirers and the critics of the close union of Church and State existing under the old regime can find in this classic controversy an object lesson in what can be expected when the State intervenes in the solution of theological problems and seeks to become the arbiter between the Holy See and the bishops. Both sides must agree that the price paid by the Church is high.

FLORENCE D. COHALAN

Cathedral College
New York

Les luttes politiques et doctrinales au XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles. By E. Preclin and E. Jarry. [Collection "Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu 'à nos jours," Volume 19.] (Paris: Bloud & Gay. 1956. Pp. vii, 383; vi 838.)

The monumental *Histoire de l'Eglise,* begun by Professor Augustin Fliche and Monsignor Victor Martin, is now approaching completion. The nineteenth volume, which appears in two parts totaling more than 800 pages in large octavo, covers the period from the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution (1648-1789). In addition to the political and doctrinal struggles mentioned in the title, the other phases of church history during the period are not passed over in silence. A brief study of the popes of the period occupies the initial chapters. There follow a brief history of the Church in Italy and a longer one of the Church in Portugal and Spain, the latter having important sections on the Church in the Portuguese and Spanish colonial empires. The chapters which study the persecution of the French Protestants before and after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes are especially well done. Those on Gallicanism and Jansenism lack clarity, doubtless because of the complexity of the problems. Quietism is treated briefly and the dispute on the Chinese and Malabar rites is competently exposed. The chapter on Christian life in France during the seveententh and eighteenth centuries is, perhaps, the most disappointing in the volume. In addition to an obvious lack of enthusiasm for *le grand siècle,* the writer has allowed himself to be too much impressed by the criticism of Henri Bremond. In addition theological acumen is often wanting. There follow rapid studies of Catholicism in Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany,

Switzerland, Austria, and Poland. The vicissitudes of the Uniate Churches of the Near East are rapidly reviewed. The history of the religious orders and congregations of men and women is related in outline, as well as that of the missions of Propaganda in the Far East, North America, and the Antilles. Brief chapters are devoted to the efforts at reunion between Protestantism and Catholicism and to the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The Church's struggles with unbelief and Freemasonry are also sketched. A final chapter treats of Febronianism and Josephinism.

In all these studies we find vast historical syntheses, preceded by accurate bibliographies, which are at times critical, and in general by clear exposés of the problems. Nearly the whole volume is the work of Edmond Preclin, professor at the University of Besançon and well known for his studies on Jansenism and Gallicanism as well as for his contributions to the collection "Clio." His collaborator, M. l'Abbé E. Jarry, who is now one of the directors of the *Histoire de l'Eglise*, contributes the excellent sections on the Spanish and Portuguese missions and the rites controversy. A production of this scope and value necessarily calls for admiration. It reveals a wealth of knowledge and an altogether uncommon energy in research and reflection in a field in which all the preliminary work has certainly not yet been accomplished. The volume deserves praise more than criticism which, indeed, would generally have to turn on what is not touched on. Many of its pages will no doubt seem over-compressed to those who know well one or more facets of the history of the times, but the judicious critic will prefer to point to the many pages which show real insight and sound historical judgment. It is safe to say that many of the syntheses here offered will be used for a long time not only by students but also by professors of church history.

EDWARD A. RYAN

Woodstock College

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A detailed description by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, with Other Contemporary Documents. Translated and Annotated by Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1956. Pp. xxi, 387. $15.00.)

This book is based upon the handwritten report of a Franciscan commissary visitor to the New Mexico missions in 1776. The original Dominguez manuscript was discovered in the National Library of Mexico by Dr. France V. Scholes, until recently academic vice president of the

University of New Mexico, to whom the present work is dedicated. It is a happy dedication for two principal reasons: Dr. Scholes is rightly regarded as one of the world's greatest living authorities on the Spanish colonial missionary effort; he ranks with the late Herbert Eugene Bolton in that field, and in some respects excels him. It was he who not only discovered but recognized the singular value and merit of the basic manuscript. Secondly, Dr. Adams and Father Chavez both are pupils and devoted disciples of Dr. Scholes, in that sense products of his skill. It is to him that they owe much of their own superlative merit as historians, in their own right, who know how to respect and to use the difficult disciplines of that science. All this enters into and adds to the value of the present work. It is to the two translators themselves, however, that one owes credit and thanks for the authentic Catholic note of interpretation which is one of the outstanding features of their work and is here singled out in this review for special mention as being of particular value and importance to the Catholic scholar.

It is to the eighteenth-century padre, though, to Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez himself, rather than to the two modern historians who have so nobly assisted him, to be sure, that the credit must primarily go, for the fact that this report on the New Mexico missions is to the eighteenth century what the Benavides memorials of 1630 and 1634 are to the seventeenth; but there the comparison ends. Benavides was a born enthusiast and promoter, prone to generalities; his memorials contain a maddening minimum of detail. Dominguez, on the other hand, was a critical though kindly observer with a dry, and, one might add, classical and clerical sense of humor which makes his report delightful reading and himself lovable. Above all, his peculiar genius, and it is startling, lay in the fact that he had what nowadays is called a "photographic" mind and eye and memory, a perfect genius for factual detail. Nothing escaped him; he saw and said everything. In short, his report is monumental; so is this translation, especially the footnotes.

The Missions of New Mexico, 1776 is a gold mine of information. Fray Atanasio visited every mission from Abiquiu to Zuni. His report is meticulously careful, detailed, and orderly, an extraordinary compilation of data, detailing the appearance and condition of each church, inside and out; mentioning all religious activities (confraternities, etc.); inventorying and appraising the condition of appurtenances and furnishings; naming and evaluating the mission fathers and their work; listing and describing books, vestments, paintings, statues, the sacred vessels for the Mass, income, property, population figures; the condition of the Indians, in fact, everything. A particularly noteworthy feature is Dominguez' list of 256 books found by him at Santo Domingo in 1776, as compared with another list compiled in 1788 and discovered while the present transla-

tion was in press. The translators have incorporated the latter in their book, and have splendidly annotated both lists. Incidentally, as one might expect, both these library lists of the good Franciscan fathers of those days rather amply reflect the Scotist vs. Thomist controversy then raging full blast.

There are upwards of 200 footnotes, expert, invaluable, and, where necessary, detailed; the 108 pages of related material are another invaluable contribution, as also are some hitherto unpublished maps, the fourteen-page glossary of some 200 items, and the twenty-one page index containing literally hundreds of items. One might almost say this book's only faults are the defects of its perfections, for it is perfect of its kind. If the translator-historians have sinned at all, it is only venially and by omission: they limit their historical introduction to the eighteenth century, whereas, in this reviewer's opinion, they might have backgrounded a bit more comprehensively the whole magnificent Spanish colonial and missionary epic, that priceless part of our American Catholic cultural and historical heritage which even the average well educated reader, alas, knows too little about.

Roland Dickey, associate editor of the University of New Mexico Press and the editor and designer of this volume, and the printers have spared no effort to make this an unusual and beautiful work of striking format, further enhanced by the forty-four illustrations, twenty-six of them by Horace Pierce, and, above all, by the colored frontispiece of the famous eighteenth-century reredos in the Church of Cristo Rey in Santa Fe. The frontispiece combines Laura Gilpin's photography with Father Angelico Chavez' artistic reconstruction, and is a little masterpiece in its own right.

ROBERT M. PATTERSON

Chicago, Illinois

The Last of the Conquistadors. Junipero Serra (1713-1784). By Omer Englebert. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1956. Pp. viii, 368. $6.00.)

Seldom has a volume been made the recipient of more uncritical or undeserved praise than this biography of Padre Junipero Serra, founder of the Catholic Church in California. Published in the spring of 1956, *The Last of the Conquistadors* was preceded by such assertions as the following:

> In his new book . . . Abbé Omer Englebert has written the first complete and authoritative biography of Junipero Serra, basing it upon the latter's unpublished journal.

And so it was that soon the diocesan press of the land informed thousands of their readers of the importance of this book, the Catholic Book Digest Club selected it for a July, 1956, offering and, as this critique is being written, laudatory reviews of the work are still encountered. What is the truth and the heart of the matter?

First of all, any comments should be prefaced with the remark that the overly nice things which have thus far been published about this book do not necessarily reflect upon the competency of all the critics; this is a book which could easily mislead all but those who are better acquainted in the field of Serrana. To two Franciscan scholars, who will be mentioned shortly, I shall gratefully leave the detailed task of a critical commentary as to chapter and verse. My purpose here is merely to establish the fact that this book does not represent what it purports to be—a genuine contribution to Catholic scholarship. It is safe to say that the two scholars in the United States today who know most about Serra are Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., and Eric O'Brien, O.F.M., friars of Santa Barbara Mission. Since 1941 the latter has served devotedly as vice-postulator of the cause of Serra, while the former has recently merited distinction as the translator of and scholarly commentator on Palóu's classical life of Serra. Both, then, are in a position correctly to assess the place to be awarded to Father Engelbert's treatment of their famous Franciscan predecessor. As a matter of record, both have expressed dismay at what they have read in the pages of this volume and there is no envy inherent in their objective criticisms. The highly exaggerated claims made for the book (and here charity requires the explanation that, in too frequent instances, an author is at the mercy of a publisher's publicity releases) as well as the failure of the author to record the events of Padre Serra's life with the accuracy they deserve, have distressed these two outstanding Franciscan scholars.

One may mention before continuing that Father Engelbert, born in France and sometime a resident of southern California but now returned to his native country, has written some previous and worthy books such as his *St. Francis Assisi* and his puckish and thoroughly delightful *The Wisdom of Father Pequet*. In these and other works, the French diocesan priest—called by his publishers a "Franciscan" which he is only in the tertiary category—has revealed and established himself as quite capable of good writing. But, it would seem, either he or his translator or his publishers have made claims for this present volume which far exceed the evidence. This is unfortunate, for by this time the attractively printed volume must surely repose in thousands of homes as well as in many libraries. Although affectionately contrived, the book does not represent a sufficiently accurate portrayal of Serra. The language of love found in its pages should never have been allowed to supplant the demands of scholarship.

It would appear that the first mistake that was made was to advertise this work as the "first authoritative biography of Junipero Serra." That book was published as early as 1787, not in 1956; and it appeared in Mexico City, not in New York; it was written by Serra's close friend and companion, Francisco Palóu and not by Father Englebert. In 1955 the best and critically edited edition of Palóu was published by Father Geiger, already mentioned above. Those who have admired the sure and expert scholarship of the Geiger edition of Palóu are dismayed at the thought that so many will now pass over his scholarship in favor of the considerably less substantial work under review. They have felt dismayed, too, at the assertion in Englebert:

> The documentation made use of in the production of this present work would come to some fifteen thousand pages . . . most of these documents are still unpublished. Almost all are in Spain or in Mexico . . . the few scattered [!] pages to be found elsewhere are in Santa Barbara (Mission) Fresno and San Francisco Episcopalian [*sic*] Chancery (p. 353).

The several assertions made here vex those who know the truth. Actually, among the most complete extant collection of Serrana must be accounted that which is housed in the archives of Santa Barbara Mission. Here will be found copies of many thousands of pages relating all manner of details in the saga of Serra as they were uncovered by Fathers O'Brien and Geiger in their archival searches in many countries. To call these a "few scattered pages" is a paltry tribute, indeed, to the industry and diligence of the collectors. Only those who have labored long in scholarship will know the reaction that such a careless statement can bring to one wedded to the conviction that Catholic scholarship is making steady progress! Moreover, Englebert has the annoying and completely unjustifiable habit of dabbling dangerously in his sources and of coming up with some "improvements" on the original. Presumably, the author thinks that Serra should have said certain things on a given occasion, and hence he proceeds to put such "appropriate" words in his hero's mouth. An example, only one of several, is found in the celebrated incident when Serra fearlessly maintained the Catholic doctrine on board ship even when an anti-Catholic captain held a dagger at his throat. But Father Englebert discards the dirk and tells the story his own way:

> . . . the brutal creature, losing all self-control, seized the little friar by the throat and began to scream: "Recant, recant, petty monk of Satan! Recant, or I'll strangle you and throw you to the fishes!" He had such a stranglehold, indeed, that the victim fainted; then he went off and left him there, unconscious on the deck. . . .

One who consults Palóu's account of this incident and Father Geiger's comments on it will realize that Englebert's version is worthy of a tele-

vision dramatization but that it is considerably changed from the original, and that it is heightened almost beyond recognition. If Father Englebert had only told us that he was writing a novel! Not of such paddings and alterations is genuine scholarship born—or its results presented to readers. Other equally telling examples of this sort of thing will be found in the critique by Father O'Brien which appeared in the Franciscan quarterly, *THE AMERICAS* [XIII (October, 1956), 175-185].

Presumably, one of the outstanding values of *The Last of the Conquistadors* stems from the fact that it is based on a hitherto "unpublished Journal of Father Serra's." Actually, this journal has already been published at least twice in English dress. The western historian, Charles Lummis, published it in his Los Angeles magazine *Out West* in 1902, while a group of Franciscan Sisters of Providence, Rhode Island, issued it in a new edition during the past decade. In any event, the journal covers little more than three months out of Padre Serra's more than seventy years!

Having expressed some of the most necessary negative strictures concerning this book, it is a pleasure now to be able to indicate that Father Englebert, Franciscan tertiary, loves, admires, and respects Serra, Franciscan candidate for sainthood. Therefore, this life is a sort of paean of praise for the founder of Catholicism in California, but it still remains true that the sort of romanticizing found within its pages belongs only to the genre of the novel. And Father Englebert does not admit, in these pages, that he has written somewhat of a novel! If he had only told us that such was his intent and such, too, his accomplishment, the strictures indicated here—never a pleasant task—would not have to be written.

One final observation in the name of Catholic scholarship would seem to be in order. Another Franciscan, writing in the New York *Times Book Review* for July 15, 1956, while pointing out several deficiencies in the book which indicate that he was conscious of its weaknesses, put himself right in the middle of things with this assertion: "Until the friar historians of Santa Barbara come up with something better on Serra, this is an edifying book to have." One's perplexity as to how inaccuracies can be edifying makes for an emphatic disagreement and this on two counts: first, Father Geiger has "come up" with something much better as mentioned above and, of even greater importance, it must be indicated that there is most certainly nothing really edifying in the presentation of biographical material about a great man of California Catholicism which is simply not substantiated by the facts. Need we again, at this late hour, refer to Leo XIII's letter on historical studies of 1883 concerning that love of truth which must animate Catholic historians, and without which there can be no enduring scholarship? Judged by the Leonine canons, long since held in esteem by scholars in and out of the Church, *The Last of the*

Conquistadors is quite the opposite from edifying in the root meaning of that still much abused word.

JOHN BERNARD MCGLOIN

University of San Francisco

God and Caesar in Nebraska. A Study of the Legal Relationship of Church and State, 1854-1954. By Orville H. Zabel. [University of Nebraska Studies: New Series No. 14.] (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 1955. Pp. xi, 198. $2.00.)

In past years an extensive literature has been published dealing with Church-State relations at the national level. Originally a doctoral dissertation, this study is a contribution to the investigation of the same subject at the state level. If the reader keeps in mind that the author, presumably for lack of time and space, has deliberately refrained from studying the influence of religious groups on legislation affecting, e.g., gambling, prohibition, and other social reforms which occupy a commanding position in their respective theologies, the author has done an adequate job of appraising these relations in his native state of Nebraska. A completely satisfactory exposition, however, would have to include the areas which he chose to disregard. For the most part this work is an analysis, and in part an appraisal, of state policy, with more local practices introduced only insofar as these have conditioned state policy.

In all of its constitutions Nebraska has publicly affirmed its belief in the existence of God, and on frequent occasions, following the pattern of Congress, the state legislature has by law registered a concern for belief in God and more particularly for belief in the Christian religion. Numerous statutes accord religious organizations privileged status, e.g., tax exemption. Any theory of separation of Church and State has never been carried so far as to reflect a lack of concern for religion at least in an integrative sense. More difficult questions have arisen in the area of sectarian religion, especially in the period immediately following World War I. In the legislature of 1919, and in the constitutional convention of 1919-1920, several unsuccessful attempts were made to eliminate parochial schools by making attendance at public schools compulsory. More successful was the Siman Act which prohibited the teaching of any subject in any school, public or private, in any but the English language. The case involved a Lutheran minister, fined for having taught in the German language, and was appealed ultimately to the United States Supreme Court where in a celebrated decision (Meyer *v.* State of Nebraska, 262 U.S. 290), written by Justice McReynolds, the court ruled that the Siman Act violated the

freedom guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Other restrictions, e.g., have forbidden any teacher in the public schools to wear religious garb. Two features stand out in the constitutional history of this question as it has evolved in the courts and other agencies of the state: 1) no single basic philosophical concept underlies the numerous solutions arrived at; and 2) the approach to each solution has been pragmatic. As a consequence the concept of religious sectarianism is as yet largely undefined. If attempts to eliminate have failed, attempts to regulate parochial schools have for the most part been successful, probably because in the main these have been reasonable.

It is encouraging to observe in this study an awareness on the part of the author of the implications of a secularistic approach to the theory of separation. He himself approaches the question with a becoming balance, reflected as well in the materials on which he has drawn as in the analysis he presents. Mr. Zabel writes with forthrightness when he cautions that with the tremendous growth of the power of the state there has developed a struggle for thought control, and that an all-powerful state will not easily allow any agency other than its own the business of educating youth. Herein lies a lesson yet to be learned.

HENRY W. CASPER

The Creighton University

Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada. By Franklin A. Walker. (Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons. 1955. Pp. xii, 331. $3.00.)

Politics and religion are the warp and the woof of the social fabric of any western nation; never can this be discerned so clearly as now. The history of Canada provides a particularly fascinating picture of this process in action, complicated as the pattern is with so many variants peculiar to that nation. Moreover, the comparatively small number of people to be observed, so divergent in such a vast terrain, makes the study at once more striking and more pitiful. Bigotry, chicanery, and ignorance abounded among them during the first century of Canada's emergence into the world of English, and along with these dark characteristics there was such devotion, perseverance, such sharp and clear political appreciation amongst all parties that the true practice of religion suffered in the struggle, and most of all in the schools.

Religion was welded to politics to form a club, both to belabor the opposition with, and to form associations that hammered unities apart, to inflict wounds that still anguish in Canada. Professor Walker has been of great help to the coming historians because of his laborious and pains-

taking examination of the vast documentation that has been laid up concerning the progress of primary Catholic education through the political labyrinth of Upper Canada up to the time of confederation. This book is based on solid research, a standard reference that will probably never be replaced. It is a work of the utmost importance in Canadian religious history, and it is well worth the time and devotion that the scholar applied to his task. It is also well worth the good offices of the English Catholic Education Association of Toronto that aided the publication.

It was a great debate, the Catholic school question in Upper Canada, later in Canada West, and one can hear the echoes of it yet. Professor Walker has made no attempt to interpret the storm of this debate. He has set forth, fairly and succinctly, the relevant documents of all sides, and there were many. It will be given to another writer, lighter than he, to gather the laurel that this Canadian scholar has so firmly grounded for him. This is a learned book, surer of long life and use than many more popular and more vivid works that might flower from the seeds of his scholarship.

The numerous education acts of the period are uncovered and public opinion among Catholics and others is revealed by excerpts from the religious press of that time. The secular newspapers show, he reveals, in their editorials, news stories, and correspondence columns, how deeply and of what great moment was the school question considered by the people. The Public Archives of Canada yielded to the author's research many of the letters of the Canadian bishops of the time, as well as the correspondence of such politicos as John A. Macdonald concerning this question. The special reports of Egerton Ryerson are exhaustively reported, and therein Professor Walker rightly reveals the significance of that education officer. The multi-volumed documentary histories of education in Upper Canada (1894-1910) are also well surveyed.

This valuable work of scholarship belongs in every learned library, and administrators of education and teachers of all degrees can learn much from this primary work of study and research.

WILLIAM B. READY

Marquette University

The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940. By Paul A. Carter. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1954. Pp. x, 265. $3.75.)

This doctoral dissertation, prepared for the Joint Committee on Graduate Studies of Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary, is

chiefly concerned with the interrelations of Protestant and secular thought during the momentous between-war years of social crisis and transformation. As the first scholarly attempt to write the history of the social gospel in this period, the monograph has the value and uses of a pioneer work. Its omissions and limitations may encourage others to present fuller treatments of the subject. For this book, as the author insists, "is not a quantitative study of the Social Gospel." Even as a "qualitative" study, it is incomplete. It is restricted to five denominations: the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Episcopal; moreover, it relies too heavily on a few denominational weekly newspapers.

But within these limitations the study presents a good generalized picture of later social gospel history. The period opened with the social gospel displaying all its erstwhile strength in the defense of labor unionism, civil rights, and international co-operation. Soon, however, the movement waned for reasons which the author expounds in a convincing manner. For one thing, Protestant defense of prohibition diverted attention from other social questions and, terminating in Know-nothingism during the Smith campaign of 1928, tended to discredit the ministry already ethically compromised by its uncritical support of World War I. In its social implications, the fundamentalist crusade was conservative, if not reactionary, and reinforced the business classes in their largely successful campaign to suppress religious criticism of the established economic order. The social gospel declined mainly, Mr. Carter thinks, because its theology stressing the divine immanence was relatively powerless to cope with the onrush of secularism which characterized the 1920's. Even the peace movement which the churches strongly supported rested chiefly on a secularist foundation.

Revival came through American Protestant participation in the ecumenical movement to which the author devotes three of his fifteen chapters. Stressing faith and order no less than life and work, world-wide Protestantism recovered its grasp on the old Augustinian realities. "The nineteenth-century doctrine of the continuity between the social order and the Kingdom of God was replaced," Carter summarizes, "by the Augustinian doctrine of the World and the Church as distinct entities in order to disentangle any and all purely secular programs from the teaching function of the Church." The uses to which Reinhold Niebuhr and his followers put this idea are well brought out. It cannot be said, however, that theory and action in the Protestant churches, singly or in combination, followed the Augustinian prescription. Although with the advent of depression the social gospel came to life again, its motivations and content were still markedly secularist, doing little more than to mirror New Deal attitudes. If in practice Catholic social action followed a similar course, it had at least an "occupational group" system with which

to confront the New Deal and the secular labor movement. Carter's pages do not reveal any distinctly Protestant approach to the reconstruction of the social order. On race relations Protestant practice lagged lamentably behind ecumenical teaching which condemned the color line. The Federal (now National) Council of the Churches of Christ in America seemed content with the "separate but equal" formula while the Methodist Churches, North and South, when reuniting in 1939, segregated their Negro members into one of the denomination's six regional conferences.

AARON I. ABELL

University of Notre Dame

A Catholic Runs for President: the Campaign of 1928. By Edmund A. Moore. (New York: Ronald Press Co. 1956. Pp. xii, 220. $3.50.)

The overwhelming defeat of Al Smith is the subject of this book; and Mr. Moore's particular interest is what influence the campaign—open and whispered—against Smith's being a Catholic had upon the election of 1928. Though Mr. Moore has examined the matter with great thoroughness and fairness, still neither Mr. Moore nor his readers can come to any exact estimate of this influence. Alfred E. Smith would have lost to Herbert Hoover even if Smith had been a Unitarian or a Methodist or an Episcopalian. The question is whether his being a Catholic made his defeat the more nearly complete.

Often it has been argued that the Republicans carried the upper South, Florida, and Texas chiefly because of agitation against Smith's membership in the Church. This contention has been less plausible since the election of 1952, when General Eisenhower carried those same states even though his opponent was a Unitarian. Doubtless the Methodist and Baptist interest had a good deal to do with the change of allegiance in the South, associating Smith and Catholicism with Demon Rum; but it seems probable enough that Herbert Hoover would have carried those states in any event. During the past year, moreover, the popularity of Catholics like Senator Kennedy and Governor Lausche among southerners has suggested that being a Catholic is no insuperable barrier to political success south of Mason-Dixon. As for the rest of the nation, profession of the Catholic faith has ceased to be a political handicap in any way in many states since 1928; and in some cities it is a positive advantage in practical politics. Although the whispering campaign which was engineered against Smith might still be utilized against Catholic candidates for public office, it is scarcely conceivable that open attacks against a

Catholic candidate in the spirit of "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" and "Remember, remember, the Fifth of November" could be of efficacy to anti-Catholic bigots anywhere nowadays.

The abuse which the Dissidence of Dissent heaped upon Alfred E. Smith, then, is now chiefly a matter of historical interest, rather than a burning question. Much of the attack came from the Ku Klux Klan and other disreputable sources; but it is saddening to recall how William Allen White of the Emporia *Gazette* and certain Methodist bishops also led the assault. Some eminent Protestants, notably Dr. Ralph Adams Cram and Dr. Henry Van Dyke, courageously opposed these slanders upon the Catholic Church and Smith. Mr. Herbert Hoover went to some pains to rebuke those among his supporters who injected this issue into the campaign, though Mr. Moore seems to feel that Mr. Hoover might sometimes have gone further and denounced specific instances of outrageous charges against the Church and his opponent.

Smith himself, as Mr. Moore suggests, scarcely understood the points at issue in the hot argument over the Catholic view of the relationship between Church and State. As Mr. Ellery Sedgwick, then editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, wrote of the *Atlantic* article signed by Smith, "What had he to do with ecclesiastical policy? He was American to the last drop of his blood. He was Catholic heart and soul. He loved his country and he worshipped God. When these simplicities became involved in ecclesiastico-political argument, it was all beyond him."

Mr. Hoover later wrote of the election, "Had he [Smith] been a Protestant, he would certainly have lost and might even have had a smaller vote." Professor Moore's study tends to confirm the first of Mr. Hoover's statements, but casts doubt upon the latter. It simply is not possible to ascertain accurately, even immediately after an election, the precise weight which various influences and motives had upon the minds of the men and women who cast secret ballots. It can be said confidently, however, that Smith was not defeated because he was a Catholic. Mr. Moore writes, "For the country as a whole, prosperity was the key issue." The introduction of radio into campaigning probably did Smith more harm than all the attacks on his religious faith: he had a poor voice for radio, and his rasping tones over the microphone seemed to many people to confirm Republican claims that he was vulgar and ignorant. Know-nothingism, though a distressing influence in 1928, did not corrupt the American political system.

RUSSELL KIRK

Mecosta, Michigan

GENERAL HISTORY

Christianity in European History. By Herbert Butterfield. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1953. Pp. 63. $1.75.)

Man On His Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship. By Herbert Butterfield. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1955. Pp. xvii, 233. $4.50.)

The first of the volumes under review here consists of three lectures in which Professor Butterfield has dealt with "The Making of Christendom," "Christianity and Western Civilization," and "History, Religion, and Ethics." The lectures reveal all the qualities for which the author is so generally respected, the sharp alertness and subtlety of a critical and questing mind, the learned seriousness of a dedicated scholar, and the moral and spiritual earnestness and charity of a Christian. In extraordinarily compact writing he moves from the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire to the development of a Christian civilization in mediaeval Europe, and finally to his account of the contemporary task of the Christian. He describes the cultural leadership of the Church in the Middle Ages as the result of its cultural superiority, for the Church preserved the heritage of the ancient world through ages of decline to a period of renewed growth. In this leadership the Church was not easily challenged by the mediaeval state. But the fulfillment of this task was self-defeating, for society became so permeated with Christianity that part of it could afford to break with the Church which, in turn, had come to be too heavily enmeshed in mundane affairs.

The period of the Reformation saw the triumph and mutual destruction of the spirit of ecclesiastical exclusivism. Therefore, Christianity, from which humanism and science had welled, fought and widely yielded to those forces in the "Great Secularization." From this ordeal the Christian emerges to the recognition that conscience cannot be forced. In confronting the world today he must not espouse the moralistic righteousness that so freely judges men only to condemn and destroy them. There is no naivete in this. Here Professor Butterfield is returning to an old battlefield, to fight against the moralistic hanging judge, Lord Acton. The author recognizes the full implications of the observation that virtue and, to a lesser extent, morality depend in heavy measure upon social institutions. It may be argued that he carries this view too far, in spite of his highly qualified religious individualism. At times he appears to see man as caught in a historicist predicament, and yet, he does emphasize very strikingly the creative power of prayer and love. In his general view the emphasis, of course, is inevitably on Christ and the Gospel rather than Christ, the Gospel, and the Church. But the lasting impact

of the book derives from the mind which in describing the Christian origin of our view of human personality can explain: "This—like so many of the most important things in life and history—belongs to a realm of matters so subtle that they are difficult to catch in the historian's kind of fishing net, difficult to assess by the measuring-instruments of the technical student" (p. 31).

In turning to historiography in the second book Professor Butterfield approaches its history briskly, freshly, and provocatively. He notes the utter death of the outmoded historian and poses the problem of the historian who survives. The latter "seems to be one who in some way or other has managed to break through into the realm of enduring ideas or gives hints of a deeper tide in the affairs of men" (p. xiii). For several chapters of this work he treats the remains of "our useless predecessors" disrespectfully. He proposes to deal with their books as the economic historian would deal with the records of a defunct business house: "so that we may learn whether there is not a history to be wrung out of them totally unlike anything that the writers of them ever had in mind" (*ibid.*).

The first four chapters, "The History of Historiography," "The Rise of the German Historical School," "Lord Acton and the Nineteenth-Century Historical Movement," and "Ranke and the Conception of 'General History'," present the author's method and reflections. The two remaining chapters are previously published articles on the historiography of the origins of the Seven Years War and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, which provide illustrations of the method and its results. The early chapters sharply mark the deficiencies of conventional historiography, conceived as literary chronicle or, coming closer to the reviewer's own work, as intellectual history. He begins with the concern of eighteenth-century Göttingen historians with general history. These men, who sought to write analytic history, became conscious of a conflict with their predecessors, and of the fact that they stood for something new. Thus they were driven to take stock of their general position and "to see in the contact between the past and the present something which requires to be explained" (p. 4). Out of this came a major beginning of the modern history of historiography.

These chapters present an important background for the work of Ranke and Acton, historians devoted to general history and, therefore, students of historiography. From historiography we may learn with humiliation how the historian's mind is molded and conditioned. Through the lack of this discipline of self-knowledge "in one age after another history operated to confirm the prevailing fallacies and ratify the favorite errors of the time." The same study suggests how careless men may be in their acceptance of a framework of general history, which usually plays a very influential role, even in shaping the general outlook of philosophers.

"Yet we, who can lavish vast areas of print on researches into some minute episode, may come to our fundamental ideas in the most casual manner possible, and may devote to them only the kind of thinking that is done in asides" (p. 30).

The reviewer has sternly restrained the temptation to quote from this volume, which is rich in the wisdom that history may provide. Much of it historians may know, but how rarely do they express it. In sum, this volume ranks among the very few important works on historiography in our century.

M. A. FITZSIMONS

University of Notre Dame

ANCIENT AND BYZANTINE HISTORY

The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries. By R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1954. Pp. vii, 592. $8.50.)

This book is an outstanding contribution to cultural history. The decline of the role of Greek and Latin in modern education, and particularly since the beginning of the present century, is familiar to all, but the various explanations given hitherto have this in common, that they are more or less vague, biased, or superficial. Even such valuable books in many respects as Sandy's *History of Classical Scholarship* and Highet's *The Classical Tradition* have not given satisfactory answers, for they are primarily concerned with chronicling facts and influences, with the what rather than the how and the why. Professor Bolgar decided, therefore, that it was precisely the how and the why that needed detailed and systematic investigation, and that this could only be done by examining the role of the classics in western education from the fifth century B.C.—but in much greater detail from the end of Antiquity—to the sixteenth century A.D. In each epoch he is concerned with textbooks and methods of instruction, with authors read, and with educational aims and purposes. His critical evaluation of aims and purposes, especially, constitutes the most valuable and original contribution of his book.

What was the main motivation for the study of the classics from the beginning of the European Middle Ages to the close of the Renaissance? On the basis of his investigation Professor Bolgar states without qualification that it was simply utility. In his own words: "It was always some urgent practical need that set the scholars to their task and gave their curiosity, which otherwise lost itself in aimless roamings, a definite and fruitful purpose" (p. 379). The sixteenth century marks the beginning

of a new epoch and a new role for the study of the classics. With the rise of the vernaculars and their absorption of the classical heritage, there was a decline in the direct study of the ancient classical literatures. The study of the classics became more and more a "vehicle of an education intended to preserve existing values . . . and a self-sufficient specialty which could be cultivated for its own sake" (p. 302). We now enter upon the age of the new education based on the *pietas litterata*, and of modern scholarship.

Chapter IX, "Education and the Classical Heritage," which serves as a kind of epilogue, is one of the most interesting and thought-provoking in the book. It deserves a most careful reading not only by teachers of the classics, but also by all these who have any serious interest in the history, content, and philosophy of western education. The notes (pp. 394-451) contain much valuable supplementary material and bibliography. Appendix I, "Greek Manuscripts in Italy during the Fifteenth Century" (pp. 455-505) and Appendix II, "Translations of Greek Authors into the Vernaculars before 1600" (pp. 508-541), indicate concretely not only the Greek authors known, but also the Greek authors who were most assiduously studied and translated. The book is furnished with an excellent index (pp. 543-592).

A few critical comments are offered, based on a careful reading—and rereading in part—of Bolgar's work. The author has usually avoided sweeping generalizations, but he has not always been equally successful in escaping the trap of over-simplification. His treatment of the Renaissance, especially, suffers in this respect. In his preoccupation with utility as the main motive for the study of the classics, he ignores or underestimates an aesthetic interest which was definitely present, if less marked in some individuals than in others. He does not seem to have known the comprehensive and penetrating studies of P. O. Kristeller on the various facets of Renaissance humanism, its background and its precise character, and especially on Ficino and his circle. Cf., e.g., Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," *Byzantion*, XVII (1944-1945), 346-374, and especially now, his *The Classics and Renaissance Thought* [Martin Classical Lectures, Volume XV]. Published for Oberlin College by the Harvard University Press. (Cambridge, 1955). Kristeller is recommended as a valuable and needed corrective for this part of Bolgar's book. Pages 55-56: On these two pages, the author indicates that his knowledge of ancient Christian Latin literature and style is defective, to say the least, for he expresses views that are at least fifty years out-of-date. Page 145, near end: a specific reference to the *accessus ad auctores* should have been made here or in the notes. Page 220: On the decline of interest in the *auctores* in the thirteenth century one misses a reference to the important work of J. De Ghellinck, S.J., *L'essor de la*

littérature latine au XII^e siècle (Brussels, 1946) II, 68 ff., with the valuable bibliography cited. Page 241: One is surprised to find that the author has given such a distorted view of Bruni's humanism. Bruni not only recommended the reading of Lactantius, Jerome, and Augustine, as indicated, but was the first to translate St. Basil's "Address to Young Men on the Study of Greek Literature" into Latin, an epoch-making translation in its influence, but not mentioned here at all! Of the few misprints noted only one deserves listing: on page 219, line 2 from end, for 1260 read 1160.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

From Alexander to Constantine. Passages and Documents Illustrating the History of Social and Political Ideas, 336 B.C.-A.D. 337. Translated with introductions, notes, and essays by Ernest Barker. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. xxiv, 505. $8.00.)

We have long needed such a work as the one under review since the period is not adequately covered by monographs. This *florilegium*, as Barker calls it, is extremely useful since it draws together passages from the writers, documents, laws, and other sources that bear upon the subject. There are chronological tables, an index of authors from whom passages are translated or quoted, and an index of persons and subjects.

We must be extremely grateful to the author for having crowned a distinguished career with such a useful work. No one would question his competence as a classical scholar and, in the field of political theory, his achievements are, indeed, impressive. Yet it is a reviewer's privilege and duty, I think, to point to those assumptions and interpretations of the author with which he disagrees and to show clearly why he takes issue on these matters. Without attempting to enumerate all the excellent points of the work, I shall refer to a few approaches and interpretations which I regard as dubious or erroneous.

(1) Barker adopts completely the interpretation of Tarn that Alexander had a concept of world brotherhood (a sort of modern one-world point of view). A number of persons, I think, believe that Tarn has crowded a meaning into the use of terms like concord (*homonoia*) and "all men being his business" (p. 5) that the terms will not bear as used by Alexander. The words to him, I think, had a political significance in that all men were to be considered as equally subjects to him and that, in a political sense, the distinction between Greek and barbarian should be erased and all could be fellow-citizens of Alexander's empire. That the "melting pot" idea in the United States is not the same as a "one-world" concept

is clear to any observant citizen of this country today. Certainly, Alexander's notion is far from being the same as St. Paul's idea of "neither Greek nor Jew—Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free" as Barker seems to think (p. 7).

(2) The contract involved in government, with the people as the source of sovereignty, is also quite different from Rousseau's "social contract," although Barker insists on identification. The Roman jurists, like Aristotle, did not assume, as Rousseau did, that man can possess and delegate to government powers which, by his very nature, man can never have. Rousseau's "natural man" is a thoroughly totalitarian creature who has no counterpart in Christian or in pagan thought.

(3) A similar error, fundamental in most modern political thought, is found in Barker's discussion of the thought of St. Paul. Barker elucidates St. Paul (pp. 401-404) by reference to St. Thomas and misunderstands both of them. Because St. Thomas contends that the inward essence or *principium* of authority comes from God, whereas the *modus* and *usus* of government may be delegated by man, Barker makes the surprising statement, "St. Thomas could thus combine the idea of divine right of kings (and of governments generally) with a conception of the rights of the people; and the mixed doctrine—half theocratic, we may almost say, and half democratic—became the general doctrine of the Church of Rome."

It is necessary for one to remember that both St. Paul and St. Thomas regard God as the Creator of man. Quite clearly, governments exercise certain powers which man never had because God never gave them to man, but God may give governments certain of these powers as being necessary for their function. And as for "divine right of kings," to attribute this to St. Thomas is an anachronism as well as bad theology.

THOMAS A. BRADY

University of Missouri

Harvard Slavic Studies, Volume II. Horace G. Lunt (Managing Editor), Michael Karpovich, Albert B. Lord, Jacob B. Hoptner, Wiktor Weintraub, Hugh McLean (Associate Editors). (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. vi, 390. $6.00.)

Perhaps the best way to convey the contents of this volume in a brief review such as this is to list the twenty studies which compose it. They are as follows: Milton V. Anastos, "Political Theory in the Lives of the Slavic Saints Constantine and Methodius" (pp. 11-38); Roman Jakobson, "Minor Native Sources for the Early History of the Slavic Church" (pp. 39-73); Ottokar Odložlik, "From Velehrad to Olomouc" (pp. 75-90);

N.S. Trubetzkoy, "Introduction to the History of Old Russian Literature" (pp. 91-103); Dmitry Čiževsky, "On the Question of Genres in Old Russian Literature" (pp. 105-115); Andre Grabar, "God and the 'Family of Princes' Presided Over by the Byzantine Emperor" (pp. 117-123); George C. Soulis, "Tsar Stephen Dušan and Mount Athos" (pp. 125-139); Ihor Ševčenko, "A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Political Ideology" (pp. 141-179); Stanislaw Kot, "Old International Insults and Praises: I, The Medieval Period" (pp. 181-209); Jury Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič as Writer and Preacher in his Kiev Period" (pp. 211-223); Milada Součkova, "The First Stirrings of Modern Czech Literature" (pp. 225-239); Waslaw Ledicki, "Grammatici Certant: Puškin's 'Aleksandrijskij stolp'" (pp. 241-263); Richard Burgi, "Puškin and the *Deipnosophists*" (pp. 265-270); Wiktor Weintraub, "Norwid—Puškin: Norwid's 'Spartacus' and the *Onegin* Stanza" (pp. 271-285); Rudolf Sturm, "America in the Life and Work of the Czech Poet Josef Sládek" (pp. 287-296); Hugh McLean, "On the Style of a Leskovian *Skaz*" (pp. 297-322); the late Jan Lechoń, "Stefan Żeromski (1864-1925)" (pp. 323-342); René Wellek, "Modern Czech Criticism and Literary Scholarship" (pp. 343-358); Milenko S. Filipović, "Folk Religion Among the Orthodox Population in Eastern Yugoslavia" (pp. 359-374); Albert B. Lord, "Notes on *Digenis Akritas* and Serbocroatian Epic" (pp. 375-383). As this volume is dedicated to Father Dvornik on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, it is prefaced by "Father Francis Dvornik" by Dimitri Obolensky (pp. 1-9) and concluded with "Bibliography of Francis Dvornik" (pp. 385-390).

The unifying principle of these essays is their connection with Slavdom and the Byzantine world. In the reviewer's opinion three in particular —the works of Jakobson, Grabar, and Ševčenko—are quite outstanding. The field of these studies has long been vibrant with emotional reactions; and it is rather to be regretted that the editors should have seen fit to evoke the ghost—and a mediocre one at that—of an ideology that had fed upon these reactions when they englished the late Prince Trubetzkoy's Slavophile vagaries. There is, however, more to this volume than shades of Slavophilism. The Slavophiles of old tended to ignore—such was the state of historiography then—their spiritual mother, Byzantium. This heritage has now been discovered to enhance the ideology and the emotional reactions in question. The chosen microcosm of the Slavophiles, overt and hidden, old and new, is a true successor to that of those Greeks who through a freak of constitutional history had come to fancy themselves Romans and to equate their dwindling polity with the universe (*oikoumene*).

Like the Byzantines, these Slavophiles tend to regard the *aoiketes* of the West with dislike and disdain; and the Catholic Church in particular

has become the *bête noire* of that part of the Byzantino-Slavic tradition which had allowed that distaste to mature into the final separation from it. The Trubetzkoy essay, unfortunately, is a symbol of much that is found in the present volume, especially of the treatment of Byzantine religious history. The role of Rome in Byzantine Christianity is consistently understated and the tendency inherent in that body of determining the spiritual by the temporal is presented as not inconsistent with Christian principles. In this connection we may note that Professor Anastos' somewhat *simpliste* account of the Byzantine politico-religious ideology has already been commented upon in this journal [XL (January, 1955), 418 n. 15; cf. 423 n. 26]. Upon the whole, one may well wonder whether those who manifest an undisguised anti-Catholic bias [cf. the *American Historical Review,* LIX (July, 1954), 208, lines 1-2) can be expected to handle adequately the delicate problems of the earlier, and still Catholic, phase of Byzantine history. This volume is handsomely printed and bound, but contains no index.

CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgetown University

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Feudalism in History. Edited by Rushton Coulborn. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. xiv, 439. $8.50.)

This is an unusual and rather provocative volume that will be of especial interest to mediaevalists. It consists of a lengthy discussion by Dr. Coulborn, by far the greater part of the book, entitled "A Comparative Study of Feudalism," preceded by a brief effort at a definition of the term, and eight short essays by as many scholars on feudalism or possibly feudal conditions in western Europe, Japan, China, Mesopotamia and Iran, Egypt, India, Byzantium, and Russia. The volume aims, we are told, "to test the extent of repetition in history" by ascertaining "to what extent feudalism has passed through similar stages of development in the different times and places of its occurrence in history, and to what extent it has recurred with similar antecedent, concomitant, and consequent political forms."

The eight specialized essays were originally read as papers at a conference at Princeton in 1950 attended by Mr. Arnold J. Toynbee, whose influence is very marked in all these pages. For this is essentially an effort to demonstrate a uniformity in history, and an effort, in the last analysis, to demonstrate the possibility of projecting the future—or a couple of alternative futures—from study of the past. As such, it is

proper, laudable, and interesting; but it is not, for this reviewer, very convincing. The difficulties with his method are by no means unknown to Dr. Coulborn, who states them with devastating clarity (p. 394): "His [the social scientist's] types are so rough and imperfectly formed, even at the elementary level of his science, that any abstractions he dares to make are sure to violate the particulars—twist the facts—to some exent. Hence the meaning the abstractions carry is narrowly limited, the actual knowledge they afford relatively small, the danger of error they involve relatively great."

Dr. Coulborn is severely restricted by the fact that his eight experts have produced for him, as a basis for his generalizations, only two cases of "proven" feudalism—western Europe and Japan. And though he argues for two other "probable" occurrences of feudalism, and two more in which feudalism *would* have occurred but for outside intervention, these additional examples are highly speculative, and cannot serve to bolster his position very much. To summarize briefly, and drastically, Dr. Coulborn sees both feudalism and a new religion as almost mechanical devices by which a declining civilization husbands its strength for an eventual revival; but feudalism may also be regarded in another sense as a stage between tribal and civilized society for those groups on the way up for the first time, and as the product of contact between such groups and a civilization in decline. However well such a formulation may appear to fit individual cases of "proven" feudalism, there is not sufficient evidence to justify a wider application of it, in the judgment of this writer.

Nonetheless, this comparative approach has its attractions, and a study of this book will furnish new insights on European feudalism. For this, and for a well-presented thesis and a pleasing format, appreciation is due. But this reviewer, for one, declines to think of the mediaeval fief as an "in-group"!

RICHARD W. EMERY

Queens College

Architectural Symbolism of Imperial Rome and the Middle Ages. By E. Baldwin Smith. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 220. $7.50.)

The title of this posthumously published work by the late Professor Smith of Princeton is somewhat misleading, for the author has studied only a specific group of architectural features, all directly or indirectly related to the city gate, palace entrance, and ceremonies. By utilizing all

possible sources—buildings, ms illumination, literature, coins, and seals—fragmentary though they often be, and never, admittedly, conclusive, he tries "to show that from ancient times down to the end of the Middle Ages, in both the Christian West and Islamic East, there was a persistent and consistent interrelation between similar gateway features, ruler ceremonies and popular beliefs regarding the heaven-like abode of a divine ruler." "The history of architecture," he reminds us, "involves much more than structural and descriptive facts made palatable by a personal and contemporary veneer of aesthetic appreciation."

To illustrate his thesis the author studies the city gate, towered facade, castrum, cupola, orbis, royal ciborium, and domical vestibule as palace symbolism and historical ideas, and he believes they reveal "a consistent use and persistent expressive intent which links together in one tradition the thinking of the mediaeval period with that of Rome and the Hellenistic East." In view of the widespread illiteracy during the centuries when rulers claimed, and were considered as having, divine powers directly it is not surprising that they should express their claims through architectural symbolism. To see how this worked out in practice and how one age influenced its successor is to enrich our understanding of the importance of symbolism in other ages and to deepen our understanding of the origin of architectural forms.

With the conversion of the empire to Christianity the meaning of architectural forms was often changed while the forms themselves were retained. Although it was Christ Who distinguished the two powers (render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's) the revolution implied in this distinction was not readily recognized by the Christian emperors. Constantine, however, did discontinue the use of the Golden Sun, cupolas, and gateway on coins following the Council of Nicea—which the author dates 326—as inappropriate to his position as a Christian monarch. Professor Smith makes a strong case for the *Renovatio Romanorum* in the Carolingian period. Charlemagne's imperialistic and theocratic concepts were expressed in architectural forms borrowed from the Byzantine world. The Westwerk, or advanced narthex with its towered facade, which appeared in the West on royal abbey churches of the Carolingian kings, probably first at St. Denis (768-775), was a kind of palace chapel borrowed from the Late Antique tradition of palace architecture as used in imperial Treves and Constantinople to express the caesaro-papist claims of the king. Since the Carolingian ruler was considered as having a quasi-sacerdotal character through consecration, this was expressed by giving him an exalted position in religious ceremonies and in the architectural symbolism of the Westwerk.

This leads the author to challenge the traditional view that San Vitale at Ravenna was the prototype of Charlemagne's chapel at Aachen. He

thinks it probable that both churches were "somewhat parallel examples of the influence of early Byzantine palace forms upon Church architecture." Thus, "the basic form of Charlemagne's chapel and the Carolingian use of the towered facade as a palatium motif must have been taken over from some one of the buildings of the Great Palace at Constantinople." The Bayeux Tapestry is invoked to show how the Normans followed a similar program of using imperial symbolism to exalt their power. In the conflict between the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, architecture, with its late Roman Empire overtones, and coins bearing imperial symbols of sovereignty, were used to proclaim the supremacy of the emperor. In 1180 the Westwerk of Sint Servaas (Maastricht) was reconstructed with flanking towers at either side of its central towers by Frederick I, who had had Charlemagne canonized (1165), as an expression of Hohenstauffen claims to the succession of the Carolingian Empire, and the caesaropapism of the great emperor.

The author's interest in showing the importance of the use of the imperial symbolism of Rome during the Carolingian period, and in the conflict between the Holy Roman Empire and the papacy, leads him to neglect the Church's part in meeting this aspect of the perennial Church-State controversy. The efforts of the Church to meet it would make an interesting study and help round out our knowledge of this side of the famous controversy. Some of the author's conclusions will no doubt be subject to challenge and corrections, but the work remains a stimulating reminder of the continuity of the influence of ancient Rome and Constantinople during the mediaeval period and of the role of symbolism in determining architectural forms.

The volume has 175 reproductions on fifteen pages and four pages of errata involving for the most part the spelling of foreign words.

JAMES A. CORBETT

University of Notre Dame

Crusading Warfare (1097-1193); A Contribution to Medieval Military History. By R. C. Smail. [Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, edited by M. D. Knowles. New Series. Vol. 3.] (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956. Pp. xi, 272. $5.50.)

Although, as the title indicates, this book is a study of the military tactics of the crusaders, it should be stated at the outset that what the author has accomplished is, perhaps, more adequately indicated in the sub-title. Certainly this is not merely another narrative of battles. Rather it is a distinguished analysis of the crusaders' military organization, the

development of their strategy, and especially the relations between military methods and objectives and the actual political and economic situations which confronted them. It is Dr. Smail's contention that hitherto there has been too much concentration on the details of certain significant battles. As a consequence there exists no synthesis of crusader military policy such as is here presented.

The aims of the Syrian Franks, in the author's view, were limited: acquisition of land or defense of land already conquered, not the annihilation of an enemy force. Force was applied locally and withdrawn when an objective was attained. Commenting on the remarkable statement of Usamah that "of all men the Franks are the most cautious in warfare," Dr. Smail analyzes what he calls the Latin field army in action. Moreover, he describes not only "famous battles" but those formerly neglected military episodes when the crusaders avoided battle or broke contact when a specific objective was obtained or when the prospective cost in manpower was prohibitive. Two significant episodes of this nature occurred in 1183 when battle was successfully avoided and in 1187 (Hattin) when Saladin routed the crusaders in an engagement which could have been avoided. Dr. Smail has graciously offered some pertinent criticisms of the present reviewer's work on Hattin undertaken some years ago. There is also a detailed study of the composition of the crusaders' armies, the use of native and mercenary troops, and the chronic manpower shortage. The composition of Moslem forces is also analyzed as are differences between Turkish and Egyptian tactics and the difficulty, realized by the crusaders, but not by all modern historians, in keeping a Moslem army in being for any length of time.

A concluding chapter on crusaders' castles, accompanied by six plans and seventeen excellent photographs, is an important if brief contribution to the subject of mediaeval military architecture. The author questions certain generally accepted conclusions, e.g., that the crusaders learned exclusively from Arab-Byzantine experience in castle-building and passed this on to Europe; or that the sites of fortifications were always chosen to protect vulnerable spots on the frontier. As in Europe a fort was a center of local government in many instances. Much more extensive archaeological research is needed before further generalization is possible. More studies like this excellent contribution of Dr. Smail's are also needed in other areas of mediaeval military history.

By an interesting coincidence several studies on crusading history have appeared almost simultaneously. Thus Volume I of the *Pennsylvania History* appeared too late for inclusion in Dr. Smail's bibliography and vice versa. The same time element also prevented, perhaps, the inclusion of J. Richard, *Le Royaume latin de Jérusalem*, which made important contributions to crusader military organization in relation to political and

economic factors, and R. L. Nicholson, *Joscelyn I, Prince of Edessa*. In addition to the plates and castle-plans already mentioned, there are three maps and an index. This volume will add further distinction to the new series of the Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN

New York University

Student Life in Ave Maria College, Mediaeval Paris. By Astrik L. Gabriel. [Publications in Mediaeval Studies, XIV.] (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955. Pp. xviii, 460. $6.75.)

This work of the director of the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame is essentially a study of the founding and the statutes of Ave Maria College. A minute description of numerous copies of documents pertaining to the acquisition and donation of property to the college forms the first part of the book and sets the tone for the whole. John of Hubant, with the generous assistance of John Beatus, established the college in 1336 and endowed it with various houses and income to make it self-sustaining. A dozen plates and maps are supplied to assist in locating each purchase and in picturing the floor plan of the college itself. The community of the college consisted of a master and a chaplain, six bursars or recipients of scholarships as we would term them today, two *beneficiarii*, poor younger students who enjoyed some of the privileges of the college, and a servant. Besides these regular members the college maintained in separate houses six other poor students, then old women, and a number of poor workmen. The founder thus hoped to achieve a happy balance between academic proficiency and a knowledge of and a responsibility for less fortunate elements of the world.

The actual policy of the college was determined by John of Hubant himself as principal superior and by a board of governors appointed by him. As an experienced jurist the founder provided for a continued expert supervision of Ave Maria College by selecting the Abbot of Saint-Genevieve, the Grand Master of Navarre, and the prior of the Carthusians as ex-officio governors. The statutes were as complete an enumeration of all the features of the running of an institution of learning as experience could devise. The boys ranged from eight or nine to sixteen and were selected by the governors from the village of Hubant in so far as possible. The contents of the library, the books studied, and the liturgical life of the students are described very briefly in the most interesting section of the volume. A series of miniatures, photographed from the statutes, pictorially represent the various functions of the students' daily life. The author does not attempt to follow the history of the college down to its

absorption by the College Louis-le-Grand in 1769. The second half of the book, some 170 pages, consists of a printing of the main documents of the chartulary of the college. An extensive bibliography and an index completes this fulsome printing.

This piece of research spells out every step taken by the investigator, laboriously so, without touching the general academic life of the city and unrelieved by any of the literary graces. A few inconsistencies in citations, use of terms, and grammar may be noted: e.g., p. 1 n. 3 and p. 10 n. 20; p. 36 n. 10 and p. 37 n. 1; p. 38 n. 5 and n. 8; p. 144 master in arts and master of arts; p. 165 Miniature 24 (P. XX) should read (Pl. XXI); p. 175 n. 5; p. 176 give for gives; p. 177 possess for possesses. These minor slips hardly detract from a scholarly volume of high caliber.

ALBERT C. SHANNON

Merrimack College

Readings and Moots at the Inns of Court in the Fifteenth Century. Volume I. Edited with an Introduction by Samuel E. Thorne. [Selden Society, Volume 71.] (London: Bernard Quaritch. 1954. Pp. cxlvi, 273. £3/13/6.)

The fifteenth century is a fascinating one in the history of England because it largely marks the culmination of the old and merrie England which began somewhere in the Middle Ages and ended with the ascendency of Henry VIII. A study of the legal institutions of that age is no less interesting insofar as we may glean from it a knowledge of the principles of freedom, of justice, and of "the rights of Englishmen," which were developed and maintained in the common law courts in the days when England shared with the rest of Europe the thinking and teaching of the Catholic Church. But it is an era which is as yet not well enough known and understood by us in spite of the scholarship which has been devoted to it during the current century.

Samuel E. Thorne, librarian of the Yale Law School, has made a distinguished name for himself in specializing in fifteenth-century source materials for the history of the common law. In doing so, he has continued and augmented an admirable tradition at Yale of extending current knowledge about that history. His latest work, done with the munificent help of a Fulbright Grant, of which this is Volume I, has properly earned a place in the incomparably marvelous series of source materials published by the Selden Society ever since the genius of Frederick William Maitland launched the enterprise some seventy years ago. The *Readings and Moots*, here edited from hitherto unpublished manuscripts, place before us the

method by which law was taught at the Inns of Court about the time that Thomas More was a student there. Written in law French, and using technical legal terms, they present a real challenge, even when translated into modern English terms. They record discussions about statutes, cases, writs, and rules, as expounded by senior members of the bar, with occasional queries by juniors indicated. In demonstrating this method of learning law, they place before us the kind of legal thinking that was current at the time, and provide us with new insight into the history of legal ideas.

No attempt will be made in this brief review to evaluate the historical data nor the editing critically. When Volume III appears a better perspective of the value of the contribution and a comparison of the work with recent comparable publications of the Yale University Press and the Selden Society should be made. For the present it must suffice to report the appearance of this work, to note its importance, and to express the wish that competent scholars could be found in Catholic educational institutions, especially some with legal training, who would be able to help make similar sources as these known to the living heirs of the ancient religious faith and of the Anglo-American legal system. Should any be inspired to make a start, he can find no more worthy place to begin than with the superb publications of the Selden Society and under the guidance of the legal historians at Yale, both of whom are happily represented in this volume.

MIRIAM THERESA ROONEY

School of Law
Seton Hall University

Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. By Ruth Kelso. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 475. $6.50.)

Professor Kelso's earlier work entitled *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century,* published by the University of Illinois in its Studies in Language and Literature [Volume XIV (1929)], provided the impulse for the present study. In order to complete her investigation of the doctrine of gentility during the period of the Renaissance, the author surveys the treatises on the theory of what ladies ought to be as distinct from concrete representations of them in history, biography, and fiction. By exploring the social background of literature she hopes to contribute to the knowledge of Renaissance ideals of conduct. Although the author is primarily interested in English ideals, because of lack of English materials she was forced to draw a composite portrait of a

Renaissance lady based upon treatises from many countries, chiefly Italy and France, written between about 1400 and 1600. The author feels that the real obstacle to depicting a constant, complete, ideal portrait lies not in whatever differences may be found in time, place, or religion, but in the failure of Renaissance theorists to see the lady as other than a woman. The portrait of the ideal woman emerges as that of the wife. There are chapters on women in the scheme of things, training, studies, vocation, love, and beauty (the longest chapter), the lady at court.

The multiplicity of authors presented a problem in the handling of the material. Professor Kelso felt that a synthesis or summaries would not convey the color and life of the subject. Therefore, she joined "other men's sayings into a patchwork of as much design and coherence as possible." This led her to omit quotation marks except in special cases. In a few instances she acknowledges using quotation marks to set off a long passage "even though I may have tampered with order and content," a procedure admittedly not orthodox. A twenty-page essay on the literature of gentility precedes a ninety-seven page bibliography in which are listed 891 numbered treatises, each with title as complete as possible in order to indicate the content of the work, supplemented in some instances by annotations of Professor Kelso. For many students of the period this section will be most valuable. There are indices to the treatises, first by subject, then classified according to nationality of the author, and to the text and notes.

ANNA T. SHEEDY

College of New Rochelle

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

King James VI and I. By D. Harris Willson. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1956. Pp. 480. $6.00.)

James I of England has never received from biographers the same generous attention enjoyed by his son and grandsons. The political, constitutional, and religious development of his reign in England has been narrated in detail by historians, but James the man is comparatively unknown, and the events of his reign in Scotland are obscure to most of us. Professor Willson has at last provided a full-dress biography of the king, and it is unlikely that his conclusions will require revision for many years.

The neglect of James in the past has been due, perhaps, to his singularly unattractive personality. Indeed, his youth and upbringing were

hardly calculated to produce other than an erratic character. Barely acknowledged by Lord Darnley, his father, separated from his mother and declared king at the age of thirteen months, tutored by the scholarly but tyrannous Buchanan, James grew up precocious and willful, deprived of all natural affections, stuffed with pedantic knowledge. The violence of the Scottish nobles disturbed his early years, and left him with a horror of disorder and faction. He collided with the theocratic pretensions of the Scottish Kirk, and, after stubbornly fighting it for several years, learned finally how to manipulate it and retain his royal supremacy over it, until, as Mr. Willson concludes, he "drew his support, not from the nobility, nor from England, but from the Scottish middle classes, from the Lairds, the burghs, and the Kirk" (p. 115). Still, as late as 1596 the king was in the eyes of the Reverend Andrew Melville merely "God's silly vassel" (p. 122).

James kept his eyes fixed constantly on England, his ambitions to succeed Elizabeth coloring his every action, above all his relations with his mother. Never having known Mary, it was hard for him to regard her otherwise than as an obstacle on his road to the English throne. He seems to have abandoned her as early as 1584, and heard with complacency the news of her arrest in connection with the Babington Plot. At the end, when her life was in peril, James was alarmed and speculated on a break with England. But he never seriously contemplated risking the succession, and Elizabeth knew well enough not to take seriously his maneuvers to save his mother.

Both in his youth and mature years, James allowed himself to be used by a series of favorites. On each he showered honors, power, and influence, and received in return only ingratitude, intimidation, and almost invariably political embarrassment. In Scotland the Earl of Lennox instructed the young king in the arts of French absolutism, and panicked the nobles into seizing and imprisoning their sovereign. Much later John Carr, Earl of Somerset, enjoyed the boundless confidence of the king, until he overreached himself and was succeeded by George Villiers. When Carr's final disgrace came with a sensational murder case, involving him and his wife, Lady Frances Howard, James refused to do anything to save them from prison. As Duke of Buckingham, Villiers was abetted by Prince Charles in forcing the king to adopt unwise policies toward Spain, and later, much to James' chagrin, entered into an alliance with a warlike popular party in parliament. At the time of his death James I was miserable, torn between his still deep affection for his son and favorite, and his rage at the impotence to which they had reduced him.

Professor Willson has clearly organized his biography, couched it in lucid prose, and supported it by impeccable documentation. The writer has remained at all times in the background, leaving his subject free to

emerge as a fully rounded figure. Particularly gratifying are the chapters on James' poetry, and his scientific and theological interests. The king was attracted toward learning and fancied himself a student of some distinction, but the author amply demonstrates that he lacked "the scholar's love of truth," and was not above putting scholarship to polemical uses. The king's gravest vices, however, were his egotism, which was fed throughout his reign in England by the flattery of courtiers, poets, and clergymen, and his deviousness, which made him suspect in practically every court of Europe. That James I was, indeed, not the wisest, but the vainest fool in Christendom, is borne out on almost every page of Mr. Willson's masterly volume.

JAMES E. BUNCE

St. John's University
New York

Charles I and the Puritan Upheaval. A Study of the Causes of the Great Migration. By Allen French. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1956; Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1955. Pp. 436. $8.00.)

In his preface the late Mr. French explained that his purpose was "to end conjecture about the conditions in England which drove thousands of people to America, and particularly to New England, during the reign of Charles the First." Pursuing this object the author uncovered a great deal of interesting information from administrative records. If his conclusions are not novel, that is to his credit as an honest historian. The story he tells is not new, but he presents new evidence in attempting to show the motives behind the actions of the lesser people who are apt to be forgotten. This book will not "end conjecture" about the problem: there is not sufficient historical material available. Yet as a sober and well-documented study, it is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of a vital but complex period in western European history. Mr. French's picture of the seventeenth century is in S. R. Gardiner's tradition; romantic defenders of Charles I will be disappointed. I feel that French had considerable difficulty in understanding the basic religious attitudes of the king and his Puritan opponents, although his account is well-balanced and informative. The chief merit of the volume, however, is its account of faulty royal administration.

The author points out that the majority of those who left England for America went for economic motives, since "two out of three went to the Anglican rather than the Puritan colonies." What these economic motives were cannot be determined exactly, because the migrants left "silently,

proclaiming nothing," although royal monopolies induced some of the lesser middle class to abandon their homeland. In the case of Puritan emigrants, on the other hand, the chief motive was religious; economic considerations were in the majority of cases secondary, when they existed at all. French was right to emphasize the significance of religious convictions in the seventeenth century. Supporters and opponents of royal policy did not divide into two different economic groups, as the latest research in parliamentary history is demonstrating. Charles I's insistence on adherence to his version of the Elizabethan church settlement drove many strict Calvinists into exile, and provided an atmosphere for revolt. That his Puritan opponents aimed at the establishment of a far more intolerant and pervasive theocracy does not alter this fact. Perhaps there is little to choose between the parties, although the stand of the "constitutional royalists" from 1641 on strikes one as the most moderate and, perhaps, the most popular. Mr. French neglected this school, but it is one which appeared after the period with which he is concerned. The author died in 1946, leaving the final polishing of the work to his wife, who has done a commendable job. The book makes enjoyable reading, and will occupy an important place in the historiography both of the Puritan Revolution and American colonial history.

FRANKLIN A. WALKER

St. Jerome's College
Kitchener, Ontario

The Royalists During the Puritan Revolution. By Paul H. Hardacre. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1956. Pp. xiv, 185. Guilders 12.50.)

In view of the elasticity of his title Professor Hardacre's preface deserves more than casual notice. It delimits this study to "the economic and social conditions of the royalists" in England. The study omits the royalists' military and subversive activities, their literary efforts, and their experiences in exile. While, as the author explains, these aspects of royalist history have been adequately treated elsewhere, their exclusion makes impossible the attainment of the book's purposes. Professor Hardacre hoped his study would "elucidate the development of the royalists as a party," shed light on governmental experiments of the revolutionaries, and introduce both the restoration settlement and the history of political parties. I am afraid that these objectives remain unfulfilled. They are too ambitious for the size, scope, and contents of the book; material essential for their development lies in the areas of royalist history deliberately avoided.

I have not said that the book is not useful. Based upon printed materials, pamphlets, calendars, memoirs, it gives a lucid account of the land revolution during the 1640's and 1650's, and of the common sense restoration settlement under the act of indemnity. Professor Hardacre's description does not move the reader to feel deeply one way or the other about the royalists' plight during the interregnum or their efforts to recover their lands after the restoration. The detachment of the author is remarkable. It is as much akin to lifelessness as to objectivity. The informative discussions of the experiences of the Anglican clergy and of the Catholics are also aloof and impersonal. Readers of this journal will be especially interested in the conclusions regarding the Catholics. They appear as opportunists rather than as a group dedicated to the royalist cause; strictly speaking they hardly seemed to be royalists at all, and are always treated by the author as a group apart. They were motivated more by hopes of winning toleration than by any principled desire to see the king restored. Hence the attitudes demonstrated toward them by parliament after 1660.

The book promises more than it gives. It is scholarly and meticulous, but it lacks informed generalizations that its detail would support and that its author is qualified to pronounce. If the author's research enabled him to state in his preface the contributions he hoped his study would make, then he should have permitted these statements to guide his writing so that the book would achieve what the preface promised.

CARL B. CONE

University of Kentucky

La pace di Milano (6 agosto 1849). By Angelo Filipuzzi. [Quaderni del Risorgimento, 7-8.] (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo. 1955. Pp. vii, 388. L. 2800.)

Tre profili: Benedetto XIV, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini, Pietro Roselli. By Emilia Morelli. [Quaderni del Risorgimento, 9.] (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo. 1955. Pp. 163. L. 1300.)

Based on an exhaustive study of Austrian archival materials, as well as on the significant secondary literature in Italian, German, English, and French, Filipuzzi's well-documented monograph on the Austro-Sardinian negotiations which followed the battle of Novara and culminated in the Peace of Milan will no doubt become a standard reference work for this very crucial period in both Austrian and Italian history.

The author's research on the Vignale armistice supports Howard McGaw Smyth's thesis in "The Armistice of Novara: A Legend of a Liberal King" [*Journal of Modern History* (June, 1935)], that Radetzky never demanded of Victor Emmanuel the abolition or modification of the Sardinian constitution as a price for more lenient terms. With copious verbatim quotations Filipuzzi also shows that the tedious negotiations for a definitive treaty were in great measure attributable to the intractability and anti-Italian prejudice of the Austrian plenipotentiary, Karl Bruck. To Vienna the affairs of the Italian peninsula were subordinate to those of Hungary, and consequently Bruck was at first given wide latitude in interpreting his instructions. The former Minister of Commerce so enlarged the sphere of his own competence as to assume in practice, at least, the functions of a secretary for Italian affairs. Fortunately, Radetzky was present to exercise a moderating influence, although the political role of the venerable Hapsburg general was necessarily a limited one.

Filipuzzi examines with great thoroughness and impartiality the two major obstacles to the signing of a peace treaty: the Austrian demand for a high indemnity, and the Sardinian insistence upon an amnesty for the Italian subjects of the empire who had enrolled under the banner of Charles Albert. Finally, in August, 1849, thanks to internal complications in both realms resulting in a mutual willingness to compromise, a treaty was signed. But as Filipuzzi points out, its foundations were laid in sand.

In *Tre profili* Emilia Morelli endeavors to analyze, primarily on the basis of their private correspondence, three rather complex personalities who had little in common with each other: the eighteenth-century pontiff, Benedict XIV, and two *Risorgimento* figures, Mancini and Roselli. Pope Benedict is convincingly presented as a man of versatile interests and talents: a scholar who corresponded with Muratori, Voltaire, and Galiani; a statesman who understood political realities and knew how to handle secular rulers; and, above all, an ecclesiastic who had a very acute awareness of his responsibilities as the Vicar of Christ. Miss Morelli provides ample evidence that his pontificate was characterized by a marked aversion for nepotism and for clergymen who regarded their office merely as a source of revenue. Although Miss Morelli provides a fairly well-rounded account of one of the most important pontificates of recent centuries, one wishes she had devoted more attention to Benedict's relations with the Jesuit Order, particularly with respect to the famous rites controversy.

The second sketch is that of the Neapolitan jurist, scholar, and statesman, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini. Miss Morelli considers him one of the "moderate" emigrés of the 1848-1849 period, and in tracing his career up to 1857 argues plausibly that his assimilation into the life of Piedmont represents a gradual "italianization" of the Savoyard kingdom. However,

her delineation of his political and cultural background fails to explain adequately why, as an administrator of justice in Naples following the fall of the Bourbons, he pursued such an anti-clerical policy.

The third and most valuable profile is that of a little-known figure of the *Risorgimento,* the Roman Pietro Roselli, who was chosen by the Mazzinian triumvirate to be commander in chief of the volunteer forces of the Roman Republic. According to his biographer, Roselli was not a Mazzinian, not a republican, but merely a professional soldier who considered it his duty to defend his land against foreign troops (French) even though the latter might have the support of the exiled Pius IX. After the restoration of the papal government and his own exile, Roselli became a virtual recluse, convinced that an injustice had been done him because, although he had served the Roman Republic militarily, he had not concerned himself with political affairs.

The two books reviewed above constitute very valuable contributions to the Quaderni del Risorgimento Series of the Scuola di Storia del Risorgimento of the University of Rome.

ELISA A. CARRILLO

Marymount College
Tarrytown

Franco of Spain. A Full-Length Biography. By S. F. A. Coles. (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press. 1956. Pp. 264. $4.00.)

For twenty years now General Franco has been the victim of inordinate partisanship *pro* or *contra,* and I am not sure which has served him worse. What a welcome relief would be a dispassionate scholarly account of his whole remarkable career! The present work is not this, despite its sub-title and the publisher's blurb. Rather, it is another eulogy, journalistic, disjointed, based on slight research, and telling less about Franco than about the author's travels and the titled persons he has met. The only addition he makes to generally known facts is that Franco, like Churchill and Eisenhower, is an amateur painter.

Mr. Coles views Franco as a sort of *deus ex machina,* who never errs and who sets all things right. There is unqualified laudation of José Antonio, Serano Suñer, and the Falange, and, curiously enough for a British author, marked dispraise of such champions of monarchy as the Queen Mother Ena, the Pretender Don Juan, and the anti-Franco Cardinal Segura. The author leaves no doubt about his dislike of democracy and detestation of the French Revolution. He likens the supporters of

the Spanish Republic to "the materialistic North" which waged the American Civil War against the "more cultured South," whose Negroes "were by all accounts happier and more contented under the feudal order there before Abraham Lincoln than they have ever been since."

Yet one should not be too adversely critical. Mr. Coles writes pleasantly and he is no more prejudiced in favor of Franco than are certain other journalists against him. The book is at least a corrective, and on several points illuminating. For instance, it makes clear the essentially composite base and nature of the regime. It stresses, too, the mutual-aid pact which Franco negotiated in 1940 with Salazar of Portugal and which helped to keep the Iberian peninsula out of World War II. There is also an interesting chapter on Gibraltar, in which the author holds that it should be returned to Spain, and that the British government, when hard pressed in 1940, had indicated to the Duke of Alba, Franco's ambassador in London at the time, that it would be returned if Spain remained neutral. This, of course, has since been publicly denied by Churchill, though his own ambassador in Madrid told me shortly after my arrival there in 1942 that Gibraltar, being defenseless against modern massed air attack, might well be traded by Great Britain for an adequate air base in Spanish Morocco.

Incidentally, the author in one place criticizes the recent anti-Franco volume of ex-Ambassador Claude Bowers and the favorable review of it by the New York *Times* journalist, Herbert Matthews, and in another place he justly remarks that the British ambassador, Sir Henry Chilton, might have been better informed of what went on during the Spanish Civil War if he had stuck to his post and not gone off to St. Jean de Luz. Claude Bowers, one might add, likewise spent the three years in France, while his embassy at Madrid was manned by Spanish caretakers and refugees.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Afton, New York

NOTES AND COMMENTS

During the past summer the managing editor of the REVIEW spent six weeks in England, Ireland, and Wales during which he had an opportunity to investigate some of the ecclesiastical archives with a view to determining what materials, if any, they might contain on the Catholic Church in the United States. The archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster have recently undergone systematic reorganization under the direction of the archivist, the Reverend Bernard Fisher, who received his historical training at the University of Cambridge. A number of American items were found at Westminster and a thorough check of the archives for materials from the United States has been promised. The manuscript collections at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, were also visited and yielded about a dozen letters from American prelates and priests, although the great richness of the Ushaw collections are confined largely to correspondence relating to English Catholicism from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries with letters from the early vicars apostolic, Lingard, Wiseman, Newman, Manning, and their contemporaries especially notable. There are at Ushaw also over 100 letters from Cardinal Merry del Val, mostly to his friend, Monsignor Joseph Broadhead, who was for many years procurator of the college. The American contents of the archives of All Hallows College have already been described in a separate note in the REVIEW. [XLII (October, 1956) 377-378.]

The most important depository visited, from the point of view of episcopal correspondence, was the archives of the Archdiocese of Dublin. In a brief sampling of the contents of the numerous file boxes pertaining to the administration of the See of Dublin from the time of Archbishop John Carpenter (1770-1786) up to that of Archbishop William J. Walsh (1886-1921) a considerable number of letters were found from American bishops and priests, especially among the papers of Archbishop John T. Troy (1786-1823), Paul Cardinal Cullen (1852-1878), and Edward Cardinal McCabe (1879-1885). Included among these letters, for example, was one from Archbishop Martin J. Spalding to Cardinal Cullen of December 10, 1866, which described aspects of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore held in October of that year that have not hitherto been generally known. Likewise a letter from John Ireland to Archbishop McCabe of July 13, 1880, contained a detailed statement of the then Coadjutor Bishop of St. Paul concerning his policy toward Irish immigration to the United States and the reasons that had prompted his efforts to remove the Irish immigrants from the urban and industrial areas to the rural communities of the American West.

Under the direction of the Most Reverend John C. McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin, a new archives has recently been constructed in Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, the archdiocesan seminary, and the vast and important documentary collections of the See of Dublin will soon be moved from their present location in Archbishop's House, Drumcondra, to the seminary building nearby. Through

the gracious permission of Archbishop McQuaid the managing editor of the REVIEW was able to spend two afternoons in the archives where he had the generous and kindly assistance of the archivist, Monsignor Michael J. Curran, who has a minute and thorough knowledge of their contents. His Grace of Dublin takes a lively interest in all that pertains to the original sources of his historic see, a fact which is attested not only by his construction of a new building to house the archives but, too, by his appointment of one of the priests of the Archdiocese of Dublin, the Reverend Maurice Sheehy, to pursue a course of studies for the doctorate in church history in the Gregorian University with a view to having Father Sheehy assist Monsignor Curran in the archives upon the completion of his training in Rome.

Among recent acquisitions of the University at Notre Dame was a book of clippings and notes belonging to Father John O'Brien, founder and for many years editor of the *Sacred Heart Review* of Boston. It was donated by John Gurney of *The Pilot* staff. Probably some of the most regretted losses in American Catholic historical material are the personal papers of the editors of our Catholic newspapers. These laymen and priests felt the pulse of Catholic life in the United States more clearly than other leaders, and their correspondence contained much information they could not, or dared not, insert in their columns.

The Dinand Library at the College of the Holy Cross has recently acquired sixty-two additional letters for its Cornelius Hanrahan Collection relating to the history of the Catholic Church in the Rockland-Thomaston area of Maine. Among them are two of Bishop David W. Bacon of Portland, nine of John Bapst, S. J., twenty-seven of Anthony Ciampi, S. J., and the Harriet C. Shaw Collection has also been enriched by transcripts of 132 letters of Louise Imogin Guiney to Harriet Shaw and her mother, Mrs. Sarah Shaw of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

There have been signs in the United States in recent years of a renewed interest in the history of Ireland. The program adopted by the American and Irish governments for exchange of scholars and research students, the increasing number of Irish subjects listed among the graduate theses in progress in American universities, and the appointment of John V. Kelleher as associate professor of Irish history and literature at Harvard University in 1951 would seem to point in this direction. Meanwhile there have been real stirrings in historical circles in the Irish Church, due in part to an appeal made by Professor R. Dudley Edwards of University College, Dublin, for the organization of diocesan historical societies over the whole of Ireland which would sponsor publication of serious research. One of the first groups to respond to this appeal was the Clogher Diocesan Historical Society, founded at St.

Macartan's Seminary, Monaghan, on December 28, 1952, under the patronage of the Most Reverend Eugene O'Callaghan, Bishop of Clogher. To date there have been three numbers of the *Clogher Record* for the years 1953-1955 inclusive, an annual volume which contains brief articles and news notes on historical developments in the diocese. The *Clogher Record*, the 1955 issue of which (152 pages) was three times the size of the original number, is edited by the Reverend Patrick Mulligan of St. Tiernach's School, Clones, County Monaghan.

A more ambitious undertaking was launched in the Archdiocese of Armagh on May 17, 1953, when the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society was founded with an annual volume entitled *Seanchas Ardmhacha* as its organ. The two volumes published thus far (1954 and 1955) run to over 200 pages each and contain scholarly articles, a document section, a division on local history, a chronicle of events for the current year, and—unlike most American historical journals—a large number of fine illustrations. E.g., Volume I (1954) had seven major articles beginning with "Armagh and Louth in the Twelfth Century" by Aubrey Gwynn, S. J., professor of mediaeval history in University College, Dublin, and ending with Colin Johnston Robb's "Astronomy in Armagh." The six articles in Volume II (1955) include "The Son of Phelim O'Neill" by Thomas J. Fee which makes out a strong case for the fact that the Franciscan Felim O'Neill, who was a contemporary of Blessed Oliver Plunkett (1629-1681), was a different person from the friar who was "the darling of the poets," and that both men were distinct from the Phelim O'Neill whose name appeared in the lists of the secret service. Canice Mooney, O.F.M., of the Franciscan House of Studies at Killiney contributes articles to both volumes on the friaries of the first and third order Franciscans at Dungannon. The final article in the 1955 issue is that of Patrick F. Murray entitled "Missionary Priests of All Hallows College, Dublin, from the Archdiocese of Armagh, 1842-1875," which is based on the work Father Murray did in the archives of All Hallows College after his ordination there in June, 1954. It is accompanied by biographical notes on fifty-five alumni of All Hallows from Armagh of whom twenty-three served in the United States. One of the most interesting of these priests was Patrick Toner (d. 1901) who came to the Diocese of Chicago in September, 1862, and served as pastor at Ottawa and Champaign, Illinois, besides building churches in Rantoul, Ivesdale, and Tolono, all towns incorporated into the Diocese of Peoria when it was erected on February 12, 1875. Annual membership in the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society is £1 and all matters pertaining to the society should be addressed to Mr. Felix J. Hughes, 23 Abbey Street, Armagh. The editor of *Seanchas Ardmhacha*, the society's organ, is the Reverend Thomas J. Fee, lecturer in modern history in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, to whom all editorial business should be directed.

A year after the publication of the inaugural issue of *Seanchas Ardmhacha* there appeared still another scholarly journal when the first number of *Reportorium Novum. Dublin Diocesan Historical Record* came out late in 1955 under the editorship of the Right Reverend Michael J. Curran, former Rector of the Irish College, Rome, and since 1939 pastor of Holy Family Church in Dublin. The original issue of *Reportorium Novum* states that it is

"primarily intended to make more generally known the sources of Dublin diocesan and parochial history" (p. xi). It contains fourteen articles, a section on notes and queries, geneological tables, and sixteen illustrations. The opening article, "The First Bishops of Dublin," by Aubrey Gwynn, S. J., discusses fire ordinaries of that see from Dunan who died in 1074 to Gregory who was recognized at the Synod of Kells in 1152 as the first Archbishop of Dublin. The articles close with Monsignor Curran's "Cardinal Cullen: Biographical Materials," in which the editor of *Reportorium Novum* draws upon his rich knowledge of the history of the Archdiocese of Dublin in a manner that serves to whet the appetite of students who would like to know more about this important figure of the nineteenth-century Irish Church. All articles and correspondence in regard to the journal should be addressed to: Editors, *Reportorium Novum*, Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin, while subscriptions ($3.00 for the United States) should be sent to C. J. Fallon Ltd., 43 Parkgate Street, Dublin.

The new historical journals of the Archdioceses of Armagh and Dublin have made splendid beginnings and should be in the libraries of every university, college, and seminary in the United States where there is any interest in the history of the Catholic Church in Ireland. A close examination of these two new learned reviews occasions only one minor regret, viz., that they were not given simpler and more meaningful titles, for their fine quality may, indeed, be passed over and neglected by prospective American readers whose eye will not be drawn by the rather strange combinations of *Seanchas Ardmhaca* and *Reportorium Novum*. Might it not be true that the sub-titles in each case would make better names for these excellent and scholarly reviews that deserve to be widely known among church historians of the entire Catholic world?

Thanks to the untiring energy of the editor, Giovanni Borino, S.D.B., scriptor of the Vatican Library, the fifth volume of *Studi Gregoriani*, published by the Abbey of San Paolo fuori le mura at Rome, has just appeared. This series of studies on St. Gregory VII and his times was begun on the occasion of the 900th anniversary of the great pope's first appearance in history (1047). It comprises now over seventy contributions by leading European and American historians of the Middle Ages, written in most cases in the authors' native tongues; a sixth volume is in preparation. *Studi Gregoriani* have rapidly become an indispensable tool for mediaeval and church historians. The price of each volume is Lire 5000. Orders may be sent to the Abbazia di S. Paolo, Via Ostiense, 186, Roma.

Volume XLIV (1956) of *Historical Records and Studies*, the annual publication of the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York, contains five essays all of which are devoted to American Catholic history. The first, "Some Problems of an Historian of the American Church," by Francis X. Curran, S. J., of Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, was read as a paper at the

meeting of the society on November 22, 1955; one of the longest essays is that of David Spalding, C.F.X., of Cardinal Hayes High School on "Thomas Gerard: The Study of a Lord of the Manor and the Advantages of Manor Holding in Early Maryland." Sister M. Patricia Ann Reilly, O.P., of St. Helena High School in the Bronx, writes on "The Administration of Parish Schools in the Archdiocese of New York, 1800-1900"; Hugh J. Bihler, S.J., of Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, on "The Jesuit Mission among the Seneca Iroquois, 1668-1709," and Sister M. Teresa Gertrude Webster, O.P., of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico, on "The Dominicans in Puerto Rico, 1510-1821." Copies of the annual volume may be secured by writing the secretary of the society at Suite 103, 924 West End Avenue, New York 25, New York.

Among the more interesting and enterprising publications in local history is *Tableland Trails* which is devoted to the history and folklore of the area where Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia converge. The latest issue of this attractive illustrated magazine is devoted to Garrett County, Maryland, a county that was organized in 1872 and named after John W. Garrett one time president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. *Tableland Trails* sells for $9.00 for four issues, published periodically, or for $3.00 per single copy. It is edited by Felix G. Robinson, formerly of the faculty of Gettysburg College, who may be reached at Route 1, Oakland, Maryland.

During the present year two American sees will mark their centennial. On January 8, 1857, Pius IX erected the Diocese of Fort Wayne and on the following day he took similar action for the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie (Marquette). The two new jurisdictions raised the total of American dioceses at the time to forty-three of which seven were metropolitan sees, a number not again increased until eleven years later when, in response to the petition of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore of October, 1866, Pius IX added nine new dioceses to the American Church in 1868. The first ordinary of Fort Wayne was the German-born John Henry Luers (1819-1871) of Cincinnati, while the famous Indian missionary, Frederick Baraga (1797-1868), born in Slovenia, was chosen to head the See of Sault Ste. Marie.

The National Research Council has named a committee to consider the advisability of publishing a handbook on the Indians of Middle America, similar in scope to the handbook on the Indians of South America issued a few years ago by the Smithsonian Institution.

An agreement has been concluded between the United States and Argentina for the use of funds in Argentine currency for grants to United States lecturers, research scholars, teachers, and students under the Fulbright Act. Similar agreements are also in effect with Chile and Peru.

The Catholic Association for International Peace is sponsoring a student essay contest in memory of the late Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts on the general subject "Social Justice in the International Community." The contest is open to juniors and seniors in colleges and universities throughout the United States as well as to seminarians in the first and second year of philosophy. The typed manuscript of 2,000 words or less must be postmarked no later than March 1, 1957. The three prize winners will receive, in that order, $300, 200, and 100. For futher details interested parties should address the headquarters of the association at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.

The ninth year of the History Discussions offered by the Department of History at the University of Notre Dame opened on October 23, with a discussion of "The Historical Books of the Old Testament as a Theology of History" led by Fathers Thomas O. Barrosse, C.S.C., and Edward O'Connor, C.S.C., of the Department of Religion. The theme for this year's discussion is "Special Problems of the Historian." The second discussion on November 20 featured Dr. Anton-Hermann Chroust of the College of Law and Professor James A. Corbett of the Department of History and stressed the economic factor in history as seen in the fourth century B.C. and the eighth century A.D.

Recent publications of Arnold Toynbee and Winston Churchill which have been widely circulated by certain popular magazines have contained statements that are unacceptable to Catholic historians. These and other events of the past few years have made the problem of the possibility of a philosophy of history a subject of animated discussion. One editor implied that if the historians did not stop spending their time in writing on technical matters the writing of history would be taken over by others. This is just a popular version of the debate over the philosophy of history. Unfortunately, not enough historians have combined a good style with technically accurate history to make the public understand that these wide generalizations of the journalists are not history merely because they seem plausible and read smoothly.

Among the members of our Association who received grants-in-aids from the Social Science Research Council for the current academic year are Richard W. Emery of Queens College for an investigation of the economic conditions in Perpignan, France, 1250-1400, and Henry S. Lucas of the University of Washington for research in France on the role of the House of Avesnes (Hainault) in the period from 1204 to 1339. Among others who were awarded grants were Norbert J. Gossman of the University of Detroit for a study of republicanism in Victorian England and Boleslaw Szczesniak of the University of Notre Dame for an investigation of the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches during the Bolshevik Revolution.

The Ford Foundation has made a grant of $69,000 to the American Historical Association to finance the initial stages of a project to film and edit German documents. On the executive board of the American Committee for the Study of War Documents set up to handle this project are two members of our Association: William O. Shanahan of the University of Notre Dame and Raymond J. Sontag of the University of California at Berkeley.

On October 4, 1956, the feast of St. Francis of Assisi, there took place at St. Bonaventure University the twenty-third annual award of the Catholic Action Medal which was first conferred in 1934 on Alfred E. Smith. The 1956 recipient was the distinguished historian, Carlton J. H. Hayes, who chose as the subject of his address, "History and Catholic Social Action."

The annual award of the Academy of American Franciscan History, named in honor of Junípero Serra, founder of the California missions, was presented this year on December 18, 1956, to France V. Scholes of the University of New Mexico. Professor Scholes has recently resigned his position as academic vice president of the university to return to full time preaching and research.

At Georgetown University, Tibor Kerekes, head of the Department of History, returned in September from an investigation of the so-called "New look" of Soviet policy insofar as it might relate to the problem of refugees. Professor Kerekes, special consultant to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, found no evidence of any real change in this matter. W. Richard Walsh has been investigating the diaries of the Revolutionary leader, Christopher Gadsden, under the auspices of the Alexander Hamilton Bi-Centennial Commission. The diaries promise to shed new light on the acceptance of the Declaration of Independence by the lower South. Two other members of Georgetown's department, Donald R. Penn and Cyril Toumanoff, have been promoted to the rank of associate professor.

Recent changes in the Department of Social Studies at Seton Hall University include the promotion of George L. A. Reilly as associate professor of history and acting chairman of the graduate division, the addition of John E. O'Brien and William Keller as members of the graduate division, and the appointment of James M. Murphy as assistant professor of history.

At the University of Notre Dame, Raymond J. Maras, formerly of St. John's University, Collegeville, has been appointed as assistant professor of history, and James White, formerly of King's College, Wilkes-Barre, the

Reverend Donald L. Siebert, C.S.C., of Holy Cross College, Washington, D.C., and Harry A. Poole of the University of Illinois have accepted appointments as instructors in history.

At St. John's University, New York, Professor Robert Lacour-Gayet has been on a leave of absence during the past semester, and Thomas J. Curran has been appointed an instructor in history.

Robert E. Lamb, C.S.B., has been appointed academic dean of the University of St. Thomas at Houston, Texas. Father Lamb has been teaching history in the university since 1953 and is chairman of the department. He did his undergraduate work at the University of Western Ontario, took his master's degree at the University of Toronto, and the doctorate at the University of Ottawa where his thesis was entitled "Fricion between Ontario and Quebec Caused by the Risings of Louis Riel."

Anthony H. Deye has been named dean of Villa Madonna College in Covington, Kentucky. Father Deye pursued his graduate studies at the University of Cincinnati and the University of Notre Dame. His doctoral thesis at the latter was a biography of John B. Purcell, first Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Martin J. Lowery, who served as chairman of the Association's Committee on Program for the annual meeting held in St. Louis last month, was named chairman of the Department of History of De Paul University at the opening of the current academic year. Dr. Lowery's field of specialization is Latin American history.

J. Herman Schauinger, author of a recent biography of Father Stephen Badin, has been promoted to a full professorship in the College of St. Thomas.

Stephanie O. Husek, formerly of Georgian College, has been appointed professor of history in the Massachusetts State Teachers College at Bridgewater.

John K. Zeender has been promoted to the rank of associate professor in the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Zeender has been a guest lecturer in history during the current semester in Smith College, in addition to his teaching at the University of Massachusetts.

Madeleine Hooke Rice has been promoted to the rank of associate professor in the Department of History of Hunter College.

William R. Kenney has been appointed as an instructor in history in Canisius College.

Mary Lucille Shay of the University of Illinois is at present on sabbatical leave for further research in Italy.

H. Vekeman, S. J., formerly associated with the Gregorian University, is now in Santiago, Chile, for the purpose of establishing an institute of social sciences.

William J. Brennan, newly appointed associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, addressed a centennial convocation at Seton Hall University on October 30 on the subject, "The Law and the Public Service as a Career."

Antonine Tibesar, O.F.M., of the Catholic University of America and the Academy of American Franciscan History lectured before the Santa Barbara Historical Society on November 2 and before the Latin-American Seminar at the University of Southern California on November 5.

Manoel Cardozo, professor of Ibero-American history in the Catholic University of America, attended the Conference on Cultural Freedom in the Western Hemisphere held in Mexico City on September 18-26, 1956. On November 16, Professor Cardozo read a paper on "American Views of Brazilian Slavery, 1822-1888" at the meeting of the Southern Historical Association which took place in Durham, North Carolina.

Annabelle M. Melville, professor of history in the Bridgewater State Teachers College, delivered the annual lecture of the United States Catholic Historical Society on November 20 at Marymount College in New York on the subject, "The Cheverus Problem: The Bishop Returns to France." Mrs. Melville is at present working on a biography of the first Bishop of Boston which is intended to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the See of Boston in 1958. She spent the past summer in France doing research on the French phase of Cheverus' life.

Michael J. Hynes, formerly professor of church history in St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, died of a heart attack on August 10 at the age of sixty-one. Monsignor Hynes attended John Carroll University, the University of Dayton, and the Angelicum in Rome, receiving his licentiate at the Angelicum in 1930. He likewise took a doctorate in philosophy at the Catholic University of Louvain in 1929 and in 1932 was awarded Louvain's doctorate in historical sciences with a published dissertation entitled *The Mission of Rinuccini, Nuncio Extraordinary to Ireland, 1645-1649* (Louvain, 1932). With the exception of a five-year interval (1927-1932) he was for nearly thirty years a member of the faculty of St. Mary's Seminary. In 1951 he was made a domestic prelate and three years later was named pastor of St. Luke's Church, Lakewood, Ohio. Monsignor Hynes' last important work was the *History of the Diocese of Cleveland, Origin and Growth, 1847-1952* (Cleveland, 1953) written to commemorate the centennial of the diocese.

Frederick E. Welfle, S. J., President of John Carroll University, died suddenly on August 17 at the age of fifty-nine. After finishing his undergraduate work at Gonzaga University in 1922, Father Welfle took his master's degree at Saint Louis University and then enrolled at Ohio State University for his doctorate where he majored in mediaeval history. He had been at John Carroll for sixteen years as professor and head of the Department of History, 1940-1946, and for the past decade as president of the university.

Theodore Maynard died suddenly at his home in Port Washington, New York, on October 18 two weeks before his sixty-sixth birthday. Dr. Maynard was born in Madras, India, of Protestant missionary parents and became a convert to Catholicism in 1913. He took his A.B. degree at Fordham University, a master's degree at Georgetown University, and his Ph.D. in English literature at the Catholic University of America in 1934. Between 1921 and 1936 he taught at various Catholic colleges in the United States, but the last twenty years of his life were devoted almost exclusively to writing and lecturing. Dr. Maynard was a gifted writer and won a name for himself by his poetry and literary essays. In recent years he turned more to history for the subject of his many books, selecting some of the leading figures of English and American history for biographical studies. In 1941 the Macmillan Company brought out *The Story of American Catholicism*, a volume which was widely read and frequently reprinted. Other studies in the field of American Catholic history followed in quick succession such as *The Reed and the Rock. Portrait of Simon Bruté* (New York, 1942), *Orestes Brownson. Yankee, Radical, Catholic* (New York, 1943), and *Too Small a World. The Life of Francesca Cabrini* (Milwaukee, 1945). Mr. Maynard also published a volume of personal memoirs, *The World I Saw* (Milwaukee, 1938), and shortly before his death he had begun work on another history of the Catholic Church in the United States for the Doubleday Company which was to run to about 100,000 words.

Thomas J. McMahon died suddenly on December 6 at the age of forty-seven. After preliminary studies at Cathedral College and St. Joseph's Seminary, New York, he pursued his theological course and continued with graduate work in church history from the North American College in Rome, taking his doctorate at the Gregorian University in 1935. During his stay in Rome he also became associated with the work of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church. From 1937 to 1943 he was professor of church history in St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, where his stimulating teaching is remembered by many of the clergy of the Archdiocese of New York. In 1943 he relinquished his teaching post to become national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, and in 1949 he was appointed by the Holy See to the presidency of the Pontifical Mission for Palestine. In these offices Monsignor McMahon gained widespread attention and gratitude for his untiring efforts on behalf of the Arab refugees of the Near East in whose interests he appeared before United Nations and congressional committees and for which he received several notable decorations. During this time he became also the accredited spokesman of the Holy See for the internationalization of Jerusalem, and on related questions regarding Christian rights and sacred shrines in the Holy Land. His personal initiative enabled the C.N.E.W.A., which is primarily an organization for the material support of Catholic undertakings in those parts of the world, to exercise an extraordinary cultural influence at home in the United States, as the source of increased appreciation for the history and ancient liturgies of the oriental rites within the Catholic Church. Most recently, he had been pastor of the newly-founded Church of Our Savior, in mid-town New York, a large scale undertaking to meet the insistent needs of the world's most crowded business district. For many years he was closely associated in various offices with the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York and from 1942 to 1948 served as editor of the society's annual volume, *Historical Records and Studies*. Monsignor McMahon was also a member of the executive council of our Association during the years 1942-1943.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Miscellaneous

Christianity, History, and Mr. Toynbee. John Wendon (*The Journal of Religion,* July, 1956).

Toynbee and the Theory of International Politics. Kenneth W. Thompson (*Political Science Quarterly,* Sept., 1956).

Aus der Werkstatt des Historikers. Adolf Wass (*Die Welt als Geschichte,* Heft 2, 1956).

Giambattista Vico als Vorläufer einer morphologischen Geschichtsbetrachtung. Othmar Anderle *(ibid.).*

Der Kardinal Balue and die Zusammenkunft von Péronne. Karl Bittman *(ibid.).*

Forschungen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Reformationszeitalters. Walther Peter Fuchs *(ibd.).*

Authority in the Twentieth Century. Hannah Arendt (*Review of Politics,* Oct., 1956).

Toynbee and World Politics: Democracy and Foreign Policy. Kenneth W. Thompson *(ibid.).*

T. H. Green and His Audience: Liberalism as a Surrogate Faith. Melvin Richter *(ibid.).*

The Mediaeval Cultural Heritage of the Mid-European Area. Francis Dvornik *(ibid.).*

A Note on Charles Austin Beard's Search for a General Theory of Causation. William A. Williams (*American Historical Review,* Oct., 1956).

Sociologia y teoria del derecho. Armand Cuvillier (*Revista de Estudios Politicos,* March-June, 1956.)

Strategy versus Idealogy. Louis J. Haile (*Yale Review,* Autumn, 1956.)

The Attitude of the Catholic Press toward the League of Nations. Sister Mary Misaela Zacharewicz, C.F.S.N. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia,* March, 1956).

Isaia profeta e i suoi figli: "segni e presagi in Israele." P. Seraphinus Gozzo, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Oct., 1956).

Der Untergang der römischen Republik und das Problem der Revolution. A Heuss (*Historische Zeitschrift,* August, 1956).

Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese (1.Teil) E. M. Kredel (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* 2. Heft, 1956).

Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese (2.Teil) E. M. Kredel (*ibid.,* 3. Heft, 1956).

The Excavations under Saint Peter's. Edgar R. Smothers, S. J. (*Theological Studies,* Sept., 1956)

The Development of Early Christian Ethics. Herbert Musurillo, S. J. (*Thought*, Autumn, 1956).

The Scillitan Saints and the Pauline Epistles. Gerald Bonner (*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Oct., 1956).

Imposition of Hands in Confirmation. H.M.J. Banting *(ibid.)*.

"Sub Juliano Apostata" dans le martyrologie romain. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*Analecta Bollandiana*, fasc. I-II, 1956).

Robert de Molesme dans l' opinion monastique du XII• siècle. Jean A. Lefèvre *(ibid.)*.

Agustinismo y Eccolasticismo. J. Zaragueta (*Augustinus*, Oct.-Dec., 1956).

San Agustin, critico de la teologia alegorica de Varron. J. Pepin *(ibid.)*.

Maiestas. H. Drexler (*Aevum*, May-June, 1956).

La questione della Regola di S. Benedetto. E. Franceschini (*ibid.*).

Rassegna di studi bobbiesi del dopoguerra (1945-1955) P. Colluna *(ibid.)*.

L'anti-pélagianisme dans le "De captivitate et redemptione humani generis". de Jean Driedo. T. Dhanis (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* No. 2-3, 1956).

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Bedeutung des Vertrages von Verdun. François L. Ganshof (*Deutsches Archiv*, Heft 2, 1956).

Bernward Von Hildesheim über sich selbst. Wolfram von den Steinen *(ibid.)*.

Studien Zur Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts III. Helmut Plechl *(ibid.)*.

Note sur l'origine du préambule dans les diplômes médiévaux. H. Fichtenau (*Le Moyen Age*, July, 1956).

Le sens du merveilleux à l'époque féodale. P. Rousset *(ibid.)*.

La population de la région parisienne aux environs de 1328. G. Fourquin *(ibid.)*.

La date du Décret de Gratien. G. Fransen *(ibid.)*.

The Gothic Evidence for "Euthalian Matter". James W. Marchand (*The Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1956).

Royal Support of Students in the Thirteenth Century. Frank Pegues (*Speculum*, July, 1956).

The Concept of an Ecclesiastical Office in the Decretales Gregorii IX. Donald E. Heintschel (*The Jurist*, Jan., 1956).

The O Antiphons Celebration in a Mediaeval College. Astrik L. Gabriel (*Scriptorium*, fasc. 2, 1955).

Philip the Fair—a "Constitutional" King. Joseph R. Strayer (*American Historical Review*, Oct., 1956).

Papal Privileges Granted to Individual Religious. Alfred H. Sweet (*Speculum*, Oct., 1956).

The Privy Seal and the English Ordinances of 1311. John H. Trueman *(ibid.)*.

The Pattern of Consolation in The Book of the Duchess. John Lawlor *(ibid.)*.

Reuchlin's Philosophy: Pythagoras and Cabala for Christ. Lewis W. Spitz (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Heft 1, 1956).

Die Wittenberger Theologen und das Konzil 1537. Ein ungedruktes Gutachten. Ernst Bizer *(ibid.)*.

Die Reformatoren und das Tridentinum. Robert Stupperich *(ibid.)*.

Ignatius of Loyola: the Man, the Saint and the Founder. Donal O'Sullivan (*Studies*, Autumn, 1956).

The Spiritual Exercises. Hugh Kelly *(ibid.)*.

A Founder of Schools. Sean O'Cathain *(ibid.)*.

To Pagan Lands. Desmond Reid *(ibid.)*.

Experiment in Paraguay. Paul Andrews *(ibid.)*.

A "Jesuit Style" in Art? Cyril Barrett *(ibid.)*.

The Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer. E. C. Ratcliff (*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Oct., 1956).

Venerabile Carlo da Motrone (1690-1763) e le sue missioni popolari. P. Mariano da Alatri, O.F.M.Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, Oct., 1956).

Stand der Kath. Missionen um das Jahr 1765 (4). P. Nik. Kowalsky, O.M.I. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, Heft 3, 1956).

Mission und Akkulturationsprobleme in Westafrika. Joh. Beckmann, S.M.B. *(ibid.)*.

The Importance of Jacques Saurin in the History of Casuistry and the Enlightment. George L. Mosse (*Church History*, Sept., 1956).

The Social Gospel and the Trust-busters. Robert R. Roberts *(ibid.)*.

Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus. R. Aubert (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, No. 2-3, 1956).

Recent Research in Ecclesiastical History in Finland. W. A. Schmidt (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Oct., 1956).

La pénétration du Bouddhisme dans la tradition philosophique chinoise. P. Demiéville (*Journal of World History*, No. 1, 1956).

Les relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort D'Arghoun et de Bela IV. D. Sinor *(ibid.)*.

Les développements technologiques en Europe de 1100 à 1400. B. Gille *(ibid.)*.

Science and the Reformation. With Comments by R. H. Bainton. R. Hooykaas *(ibid.)*.

Koreas erste Berührung mit dem Christentum. J. Daures (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, Heft 3, 1956).

Die Missionsfahrt Bruder Wilhelms von Rubruk zu den Mongolen 1253-1255. Ein Hinweis auf ihre Bedeutung. Ch. Schollmeyer *(ibid.)*.

Giovani Papini. Hernando Rivas Sacconi. (*Revista Javeriana*, Oct., 1956).

The "Governing Organs" of the Union of Soviet Writers. Jack F. Matlock, Jr. (*American Slavic and East European Review*, Oct., 1956).

European

Historical Revision: The Causes of the Hundred Years War. G. P. Cuttino *Speculum*, July, 1956).

Les bulles pontificales et l'expansion portugaise au XV• siècle. Ch.-M. de Witte (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, No. 2-3, 1956).

Le Catholicisme en Autriche depuis 1945. Otto Forst De Battaglia (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, Sept., 1956).

Origin of German Christian Democracy. T. Bouscaren (*Thought*, Autumn, 1956).

Zur Gleichschaltung der deutschen Volksgruppen durch das dritte Reich. H. von Rimscha (*Historische Zeitschrift*, August, 1956).

Socio-Economic Changes in Post-War Poland. W. J. Stankiewicz (*Political Science Quarterly*, Sept., 1956).

Hungarian Society in the Time of the Regency (1920-1944). John Kosa (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, Oct., 1956).

The Spanish-Civil War—Twenty Years After. Peter M. Dunne, S. J. (*Historical Bulletin*, Nov., 1956).

British and Irish

The Clericus in the Legal Administration of Thirteenth Century England. Frank Pegues (*English Historical Review*, Oct., 1956).

Forfeiture for Treason in the Reign of Richard II. C. D. Ross *(ibid.)*.

The Volunteer Movement as an Anti-Revolutionary Force, 1793-1801. J. R. Western *(ibid.)*.

The Coronation Oath of 1308. Robert S. Hoyt (*English Historical Review*, July, 1956).

Abbot Thomas Ramryge's Lost Register, and the Date of William Wallingford's Death. C.I.A.Ritchie *(ibid.)*.

The Irish Precedent for English Church Reform: The Church Temporalties Act of 1833. Olive J. Brose *(ibid.)*.

Die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen England und dem Heiligen Stuhl im 19. Jahrhundert. N. Miko (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 2 Heft, 1956).

Sir Arthur Gordon and the Introduction of Indians into the Pacific. I. M. Cumpston *(ibid.)*.

American

America in European Diplomacy 1597-1604. Roland Dennis Hussey (*Revista de Historia de America*, June, 1956).

The Irish in America. Edward Maguire (*Historical Bulletin*, Nov., 1956).

Astrology in Colonial America: An Extended Query. William D. Stahlman (*William and Mary Quarterly*, Oct., 1956).

How Democratic was Roger Williams? Alan Simpson *(ibid.)*.

Religious Affiliation in 17th Century Maryland. George B. Scriven (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Sept., 1956).

Education in Georgia during the Period of Royal Government, 1752-1776:

Public School Masters and Private Venture Teachers. Robert L. McCaul (*Georgia Historical Quarterly*, Sept., 1956).

Frontenac's Military Policies, 1689-1698 A Reassessment. W. J. Eccles (*Canadian Historical Review*, Sept., 1956).

Andrew Jackson and the Judiciary. Richard P. Longaker (*Political Science Quarterly*, Sept., 1956).

The Historian's Stake in Federal Records. Philip C. Brooks (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Sept., 1956).

The Territorial Governor as Indian Superintendent in the Trans-Mississippi West. William M. Neil *(ibid.)*.

The Kansas-Nebraska Act: A Century of Historiography. Roy V. Nichols *(ibid.)*.

The Grand Jury on the Frontier. Richard D. Younger (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Autumn, 1956).

The California Societies in France, 1849-1855. Henry Blumenthal (*Pacific Historical Review*, Aug. 1956).

Methodists and "Butternuts" in the Old Northwest. Ralph E. Morrow (*Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Spring, 1956).

Colorado Volunteers Save Mexico for the Union. Martin Hardwick Hall (*Mid-America*, Oct., 1956).

Rival Urban Communication Schemes for the Possession of the Northwest Trade, 1783-1800. George Ruble Woolfolk *(ibid.)*.

The Klamath Indians and The Treaty of 1864. Theodore Stone (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, Sept., 1956).

Reflection on the Historiography of American Entry into World War II. William Appleman Williams *(ibid.)*.

The Mormons and Politics in Illinois: 1839-1844. George R. Gaylor (*Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Spring, 1956).

Western Attitudes and Reconstruction Politics in Illinois, 1865-1872. Harris L. Dante (*ibid.*, Summer, 1956).

Railroad Strikers in Court: Unreported Contempt Cases in Illinois in 1877. Elwin W. Sigmund *(ibid.)*.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Strike of 1877. Clifton K. Yearley, Jr. (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, Sept., 1956).

John Beach and the Removal of the Sauk and Fox from Iowa. Donald J. Berthrong (*Iowa Journal of History*, Oct., 1956).

The Special Indian Agency in Alaska, 1873-1874: Its Origin and Operations. Donald R. McCoy (*Pacific Historical Review*, Nov., 1956).

Catholic Serials in the 19th Century in the United States. A Bibliographical Survey and a Union List. Eugene P. Willging and Herta Hatzfeld (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, March, 1956).

Sketch of the Life of Mother Katherine Drexel. Helen Grace Smith *(ibid.)*.

It was Fun to be a Soldier. Martha Swain (*American Heritage*, August, 1956).

How They Killed the Buffalo. Wayne Gard *(ibid.)*.

Myths That Hid the American Indian. Oliver LaFarge (*ibid.*, Oct., 1956).

Claude G. Bowers, Historian. Oliver Knight (*Indiana Magazine of History*, Sept., 1956).

San Francisco's Blind Boss. Alexander Callow, Jr. (*Pacific Historical Review*, Aug., 1956).

The Antecedents of St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee. Peter Leo Johnson (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Autumn, 1956).

La mentalité et l'outillage économique de l'habitant canadien (1760). A propos d'um document sur l'encan. Fernand Ouellet (*Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, July-Aug.-Sept., 1956).

Mexico y lo Mexicano. John Leddy Phelan (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, Aug., 1956).

Handbook of South American Indians. Noticias sobre Missiones y bibliografia Franciscana. P. Diosdado Merino, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano*, 1956).

Algunos problemas actuales de la historia del periodo hispanico peruano. Daniel Valcafcel *(ibid.)*.

Problemas de la historia social en Hispano America colonial. Richard Konetzke *(ibid.)*.

Expansión de las Clarisas en America y Extremo Oriente. P. Fedel de Lejarza, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

The Relation between the Noticias Secretas and the Viaje a la America Meridional. Luis Marino (*The Americas*, Oct., 1956).

Irving's Columbus: A Problem of Romantic Biography. William L. Hedges *(ibid.)*.

Some Franciscan Sources in the Archives and Libraries of America. Lino G. Canedo *(ibid.)*.

Genesis y etapas de la penetración protestante en Iberoamerica. Prudencio Damboriena, S.J. (*Hispanoamericanos*, August, 1956).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Alegre, Francisco Javier, S.J. *Historia de la Provincia de la Compania de Jesus de Nueva Espana* [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici, S.J., Vol. IX.] Edited by Ernest J. Burrus, S.J., and Felix Zubillaga, S.J. (Roma: Institutum Historicum. S.J. 1956. Pp. xxxii, 640.)

American Heritage Reader. This is the first in a series of paperback volumes to contain selections taken from the magazine of history of the same name. This first volume contains twenty articles by well known writers and, too, eight pages of full-color illustrations. This new series is a token of the success attained by *American Heritage* of which Bruce Catton is editor. (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. 253. $0.50.)

Andrieu, Michel. *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age.* IV *Les Textes (Suite)* (Ordines XXXV-XLIX). (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. 1956. Pp. xi, 543.)

Arenth, Sister M. Aurelia, O.S.F. *As a Living Oak. Biography of Mother Baptista Etzel, Third Mother Superior of the Sisters of St. Francis, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Press, 1956. Pp. vi, 133. $3.00.)

Baer, Kurt. *The Treasures of Mission Santa Ines. A History of the Catalog of the Paintings, Scripture, and Craft Works.* (Fresno: Academy of California Church History. 1956. Pp. 323. $5.00.)

Bailey, James Henry, II. *A History of the Diocese of Richmond. The Formative Years.* (Richmond: Chancery Office, Diocese of Richmond. 1956. Pp. 249. $2.25.)

Bardens, Dennis. *Portrait of a Statesman. (The personal life story of Sir Anthony Eden.)* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1956. Pp. 326. $6.00.)

Beatriz, Bosch. *Los Tratados de Alcaraz.* (Buenos Aires: Imprenta de la Universidad. 1955. Pp. 58, xlix.)

Billington, Ray Allen. *The Far Western Frontier, 1830-1860.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1956. Pp. xix, 324. $5.00.)

Bouuaert, F. Claeys. *L'ancienne Université de Louvain. Etudes et Documents.* (Louvain: Editions E. Nauwelaerts. 1956. Pp. vii, 341. 200 Frs. belges.)

Bouyer, Louis. *The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism.* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1956. Pp. xi, 234. $3.75.)

Brunner, August, S.J. *A New Creation, Towards a Theology of the Christian Life.* Father Brunner is editor of the German Catholic weekly, *Stimmen der Zeit.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. 143. $4.75.)

Capote, Rita Maria Cancio R. *José Toniola.* (New York: Eliseo Torres, Spanish Books, 1469 St. Lawrence Ave. 1956. Pp. 356. $4.00.)

Celier, Léonce. *Frédéric Ozanam, 1813-1853.* This little volume is No. X of the Collection Apotres d'aujourd'hui. (Paris: P. Lethielleux. Editeur. 1956. Pp. xii, 148. 550 fr.)

Cheney, C. R. *From Becket to Langton—English Church Government, 1170-1213.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 212. 18s.)

Cohn, David L. (Ed.) *The Life and Times of King Cotton.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. viii, 286. $5.00.)

Colgrave, Bertram. *Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac. Introduction Text, Translation and Notes.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1956. Pp. xv, 205. $5.50.)

Corbett, James A. *The De Instructione de Puerorum of William of Tournai, O.P.* No. III of Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education edited by Astrik L. Gabriel and Joseph N. Garvin. The Latin text has been edited with notes and a six-page introduction by James A. Corbett, professor of mediaeval history at Notre Dame. (Notre Dame: Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame, 1955. Pp. 50. $1.00.)

Dempsey, J. *Mission on the Nile.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. vii, 247. $6.00.)

Desautels, Alfred R., S.J. *Les Mémoires de Trévoux et le Mouvement des Idees au XVIII^e Siècle, 1701-1734.* [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. Vol. VIII.] (Roma: Institutum Historicum, S.I. 1956. Pp. xxvii, 256. $4.00.)

Deutsch, Karl W. *Interdisciplinary Bibliography on Nationalism.* This bibliography by the professor of history and political science in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been drawn up from the point of view "of the unity of science." (Cambridge: Technology Press of M.I.T. 1956. Pp. 165.)

Devlin, Christopher. *The Life of Robert Southwell—Poet and Martyr.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1956. Pp. x, 367. $5.00.)

Dondaine, Antoine. *Secrétaires de Saint Thomas.* (Roma: Editori di S. Tommaso. 1956. Pp. 277; *Planches* 15, XL.)

Duckett, Eleanor Shipley. *Alfred the Great. The King and His England.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. viii, 220. $3.75.)

Engelbert, Omer. *Adventurer Saints.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1956. Pp. vi, 276. $4.00.)

Ellis, Harry B. *Heritage of the Desert. (The Arabs and the Middle East.)* (New York: Ronald Press Co. 1956. Pp. vii, 311. $5.00.)

Ellis, John Tracy (Ed.). *Documents of American Catholic History.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1956. Pp. xxiv, 677. $8.75.)

Eustace, P. Beryl (Ed.). *Registry of Deeds. Dublin. Abstracts of Wills.* Volume I, *1708-1745;* Volume II, *1746-1785.* (Dublin: Stationery Office. 1954-1956. Pp. xii, 430; iv, 453. 40s per volume.)

Festugière, A. J., O.P. *Epicurus and His Gods.* An excellent critical evaluation of the religious ideas of Epicurus based on a firsthand knowledge of the ancient sources for his life and teachings. The essential tenets of Stoicism are also described and a comparison made with those of Epicureanism. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 100. $2.25.)

Folwell, William Watts. *A History of Minnesota.* Volume I. This is a reprint of a volume first published in 1921 which adds new maps and illustrations and corrects minor errors. Folwell, who died in 1929, brought the Minnesota story down to 1857 in this, the first of his four-volume work. (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1956. Pp. xvii, 533. $6.50.)

Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom—A History of American Negroes.* Second edition revised and enlarged. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1956. Pp. xv, 639, xlii. $5.50 text; $7.50 trade.) Professor Franklin is chairman of the Department of History in Brooklyn College. He has here revised the 1947 edition of his book, altered some of the material, brought the bibliography up to date, and written a new concluding chapter. In future editions the remark concerning the organization after the Revolution of American churches separate from their European sponsors, insofar as it relates to the Catholic Church, needs to be revised. To say that even the American Catholics "were to be set apart and controlled by a special Prefect Apostolic" (p. 160) is not correct. They were not "set apart" in the sense of being separated from the Holy See and the official (John Carroll) named by Rome in 1784 to govern them had the title superior of the American missions, not prefect apostolic.

Franz, Georg. *Kulturkampf Staat und katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa.* (Munchen: Verlag Georg D. W. Callwey. 1956. Pp. 355.)

George, Alexander L. and Juliette L. George. *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House—A Personality Study.* (New York: The John Day Company, Inc. 1956. Pp. xvii, 362, $6.00.)

Gewirth, Alan. *Marsilius of Padua. The Defender of Peace.* Vol. II: *The Defensor pacis.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. Pp. xci, 450. $8.50.)

Graubard, Stephen Richards. *British Labour and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1924.* Mr. Graubard's book is Volume XXX of the Harvard Historical Monographs; he teaches history and general education at Harvard. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. 292. $5.50.)

Haraszti, Zoltán. *The Enigma of the Bay Psalm Book* and *The Bay Psalm Book. Facsimile of the First Edition of 1640.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 144. 2 vols. $10.00.)

Harbison, E. Harris. *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1956. Pp. ix, 177. $3.00.)

Harkins. William E. *Dictionary of Russian Literature.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. vi, 439. $10.00.)

Harwell, Richard Barksdale (Ed.). *The Committees of Safety of Westmoreland and Fincastle. Proceedings of the County Committees, 1774-1776.* (Richmond: Virginia State Library. 1956. Pp. 127.)

Idell, Albert. Translated and edited by—*The Bernal Diaz Chronicles—The True Story of the Conquest of Mexico.* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1956. Pp. 414, $5.00.)

Hollis, Christopher. *A Study of George Orwell. The Man and His Works.* A biography of the author of *Animal Farm* and *1984* by a schoolmate of Eton College days. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1956. Pp. viii, 212. $3.75.)

Horgan, Paul. *The Centuries of Santa Fe.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. xiii, 363. $5.00.)

Johnson, Peter Leo. *Halcyon Days (Story of St. Francis Seminary—Milwaukee —1856-1956.)* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1956. Pp. xii, 416. $5.00.)

Jorgenson, Lloyd P. *The Founding of Public Education in Wisconsin.* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin. 1956. Pp. viii, 252. $4.00.)

Kelly, Sir David. *The Hungry Sheep.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1956. Pp. xvi, 244. $4.00.)

Kendall, Paul Murray. *Richard the Third.* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. 602. $5.95.)

LaFarge, John, S.J. *The Catholic Viewpoint on Race Relations.* This volume is the first in the Catholic Viewpoint Series intended, as the editor states in his introduction to Father LaFarge's book, to emphasize various problems "in which there have been misunderstandings and differences of opinion" about the Catholic Church. (New York: Hanover House. 1956. Pp. 190. $2.95.)

Lanning, John Tate. *The Eighteenth-Century Enlightenment in the University of San Carlos de Guatemala.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1956. Pp. xv, 372. $6.50.)

Link, Arthur S. *Wilson. The New Freedom.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 504. $7.50.)

McKelvey, Blake. *Rochester. The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xiv, 432. $6.00.)

McNamara, Robert F. *The American College in Rome, 1855-1955.* (Rochester: Christopher Press, Inc. 1956. Pp. xxiii, 858. $15.00.)

Marrou, H. L. *A History of Education in Antiquity.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1956. $7.50.)

Medlicott, W. N. *Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe.* (New York: John DeGraff, Inc. 1956. Pp. xiv, 353. $7.00.)

Mikus, Joseph A. *La Slovaquie dans le drama de l'Europe. (Histoire politique de 1918 à 1950.)* (Paris: Les Iles d'Or. 1956. Pp. 475.)

Miller, Perry. *Errand Into the Wilderness.* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 244. $4.75.)

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Birth of the Republic, 1763-89.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 177. $1.75, paper; $3.00, cloth.)

Mulert, Hermann. *Konfessionskunde. Die Christlichen Kirchen und Sekten Heute.* 3rd rev. ed. by Erdmann Schott. (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann. 1956. Pp. xxi, 557. DM 28.50.)

Murphy, Roland E., O.Carm. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 119. $1.50.) The book tells the story of the finding and publication of the famous scrolls, and their contributions to our understanding of both Old and New Testaments. The author, associate professor of Sacred Scripture in the Catholic University of America, has utilized the latest research and given a balanced judgment on matters that have been distorted and exaggerated in several popular publications. It will be read with profit by the educated non-specialist.

Nash, Robert, S.J. (Ed.). *Jesuits. Biographical Essays.* A series of nineteen brief popular sketches of members of Loyola's company from St. Ignatius himself to the late Father Daniel Lord. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1956. Pp. xvi, 230. $3.50.)

Newman, Cardinal. *Faith and Prejudice.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1956. Pp. 128. $2.50.) A group of seven hitherto unpublished sermons.

Olgiati, Francesco. *L'Università Cattolica del Sacre Cuore.* Volume I. (Milano: Soc. Ed. Vita E. Pensiero. 1956. Pp. xxiii, 499.)

Pattee, Ricardo. *Haiti-Pueblo Afroantillano.* (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispanica. 1956. Pp. 446. 149 p.)

Patterson, Francis Taylor. *The Long Shadow. The Story of St. Jean de Brébeuf.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1956. Pp. 288. $3.25.) A fictionalized biography of the Jesuit martyr.

Percheron, René. *Visiting Mont St. Michel.* In addition to thirty-two handsome photographs of the principal architectural wonders of this famous old Norman abbey, this little booklet contains a good historical background and a guide for visitors. (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1956. Pp. 24 (32 illustrations). 250 fr.)

Pollard, Hugh M. *Pioneers of Popular Education, 1760-1850.* (London: John Murray. 1956. Pp. xii, 297. 28s net.)

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Volume LXIX. *October, 1947-May, 1950.* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1956. Pp. xviii, 536.)

Putz, Louis J., C.S.C. (Ed.). *The Catholic Church, U. S. A.* (Chicago: Fides Publishers. 1956. Pp. xxiii, 415. $5.95.)

Queen, William M. *The Doctor's Widow: The Story of a Good Neighbor.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. 1956. Pp. 127. $3.25.)

Raab, Heribert. *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae in der Kanonistischen Diskussion Des. 17, Bis. 19. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der*

Episkopalistischen Theorie in Deutschland. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag Gmbh. 1956. Pp. xvii, 204. 18 DM.)

Ramon, Sister M., O.P., and Katherine Rankin. *A Book of Joy. An Anthology of Prose and Poetry Designed for Teachers of Young Children.* A volume in the Faith and Freedom Series. (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1956. Pp. xviii, 295. $4.00.)

Révész, G. *The Origins and Prehistory of Language.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. viii, 240. $7.50.)

Richardson, Albert E., and Hector O. Corfiato. *The Art of Architecture.* 3rd ed. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. xxviii, 663. $25.00.)

Scammell, G. V. *Hugh Du Puiset. Bishop of Durham.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 355. $7.50.)

Schellenberg, T. R. *Modern Archives.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. xv, 248. $5.00.)

Schevill, Ferdinand. *Six Historians.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 201. $5.00.)

Schweizer, Josef (Ed.). *Ambrosius Catharinus Politus O.P.R. Apologia Pro-veritate Catholicae et Apostolicae Fider. . . .* This volume, containing an introduction and a scholarly edition of the text, is No. 27 of the Series: *Corpus Catholicorum. Werke Katholischer Schriftsteller im Zeitaltes der Glanbensspaltung.* (Munster in Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuch-handlung. 1956. Pp. xxviii, 372. DM 32.25.)

Simon, A. *L'hypothese liberale en Belgique. Documents inedits, 1839-1907.* (Wetteren: Editions Scaldis. 1956. Pp. 381.)

Solomon, Barbara Miller. *Ancestors and Immigrants. A Changing New England Tradition.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 276. $4.75.)

Spinka, Matthew. *The Church in Soviet Russia.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 179. $3.25.)

Stern, Madeleine B. *Imprints on History. Book Publishers and American Frontiers.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1956. Pp. 492. $7.50.)

Stolpe, Sven. *The Maid of Orleans.* (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1956. Pp. vii, 311. $4.00.) An historical novel about St. Joan of Arc by a Swedish writer who was converted to Catholicism in 1947 at the Abbey of Sainte-Marie in Paris. Mr. Stolpe is a leading critic for the Stockholm *Aftonbladet.*

Suez Canal Problem. July 26-September 22, 1956. [Department of State Publication 6392.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1956. Pp. xvi, 370. $1.25.)

Sweden and the United Nations. (New York: Manhattan Publishing Co. 1956. Pp. x, 315. $3.00.) (This volume is one in a series entitled National Studies on International Organization initiated by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.)

Thomas, Alfred Barnaby. *Latin America: A History.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1956. Pp. xiii, 801. $6.50.)

Trusen, Winfried. *Um Die Reform Undeinheit Der Kirche, Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels.* (Munster in Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlags-buchhandlung. 1956. DM Kart. 4.80.)

Twemlow, J. A. *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, 1471-1484.* Volume XIII, Parts I and II. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1955. Pp. xvi, 470; 471-1268. Pt. I 84s [£4 4s]; Pt. II [£7 7s].)

Tyler, Royall: *The Emperor Charles the Fifth.* (Fair Lawn, New Jersey: Essential Books, Inc. 1956. Pp. 375. $7.50.)

Van den Baar, P. A. *Die Kirchliche Lehre der Translatio Imperii Romani.* (Volume LXXVIII Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae Sectio B [n. 12]). (Roma: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae. 1956. Pp. XX, 152.)

Voegelin, Eric. *Order and History*—Volume One—*Israel and Revelation.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1956. Pp. xiv, 533. $7.50.)

Warner, Emily Smith with Hawthorne Daniel. *The Happy Warrior. A Biography of My Father, Alfred E. Smith.* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. 320. $4.50.)

Weiser, Francis X., S.J. *The Holyday Book.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1956. Pp. 217. $3.00.)

Welter, L. *La Réforme ecclésiastique du Diocèse de Clermont au XVII^e Siècle.* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1956. Pp. 283. Frs. 1000.)

Williams, Frederick Vincent. *Martyrs of Nagasaki.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild, 1956. Pp. 145. $3.75.)

Wiltgen, Ralph M., S.V.D. *Gold Coast Mission History (1471-1880).* (Techny: Divine Word Publications. 1956. Pp. xvi, 181. $3.00.)

Worcester, Donald E., and Wendell G. Shaeffer. *Growth and Culture in Latin America.* A textbook by the head of the Department of History in the University of Florida and the Headquarters Supervisor at the Public Administration Service in Chicago. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. xvii, 963. $8.50.)